The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXX, No. 1 JANUARY, 1954

CONTENTS

The Two Pillars of Rome ..... *John W. Moran, S.J.* 1

Our Lady and the Unity Octave ..... *Titus Cranny, S.A.* 9

Muintir-Na-Tire ..... *James F. Cassidy* 29

The Historical Backgrounds and Theology of *Mediator Dei*. Part II ..... *Albert F. Kaiser, C.PP.S.* 33

Our Lady's Virginity *In Partu* ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 46

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

The Proper Attitude toward "Muddled Marriages" 54

A Marriage Problem: Correction of a Previous Response 55

The Stolen Horse 56

Interrupting Holy Mass 57

Missa Pro Populo again 58

Renewal of the Sacred Species 58

Monstrance Design 59

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1954, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Liturgical Problems concerning the Blessed Sacrament . . . 59

Use of the Organ . . . 60

Metropolitan Cross . . . 60

Cloth of Gold for Vestments . . . 61

ANALECTA

Indulgences for Mary's Year . . . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 62

BOOK REVIEWS

Reality and Judgment according to St. Thomas, *by Peter Hoenen, S.J.* 65

Outlines of Moral Theology, *by Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* . . 68

Father Tompkins of Nova Scotia, *by George Boyle* 71

SAVE several dollars
ON THESE BLACK HATS OF FINE QUALITY

Soft Hat (Style A) **$5.95**
Snap brim

Pure Black Homburg **$9.95**
dignified in appearance
excellent quality

Soft Hat (Style B) **$5.95**
more conservative
worn off the face, brim up

All our hats are made of genuine fur felt, pure black dye, reeded leather sweat band, silk lining and grosgrain binding. They sell for more in the stores and are worth it. We will save you money.

We guarantee correct fit and satisfaction or your money back. Choose your style and order by mail today with your check or money order. Specify Head Size_____
☐ Regular ☐ Long • Preferred Brim Width ☐ Narrow ☐ Medium ☐ Wide.

WALDRON & WHEALN
Custom Hatters to The Clergy Exclusively
22 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK 3, N. Y. **WATKINS 9-3339**

THE TWO PILLARS OF ROME

Rationalists and Modernists have spent much labor in trying to find differences between the theological views of St. Paul and the Synoptics. They have been well refuted by Catholic and by not a few non-Catholic scholars. The present article proposes to establish the identity of the theological tenets of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Christianity is based upon the revealed truths that Christ was God, and that by His death he redeemed us and atoned for our sins. These truths are clearly set forth by both Apostles.

Christ before his Incarnation "was by nature God . . . he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God also has exalted him and has bestowed on him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bend of those in heaven, on earth and under the earth" (*Phil.* 2:5-11).[1] Christ is "over all things, God blessed forever" (*Rom.* 9:5).[2] As for the Prince of the Apostles, he boldly charged the Jews, "The author of life you killed" (*Acts* 3:15).

Christ by his death ransomed us from the slavery of sin and reconciled us to God, "You have been bought at a great price" (*I Cor.* 6:20).[3] "You know that you were redeemed from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers, not with perishable things, with silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (*I Pet.* 1:18-20).[4]

Considered in its relation to us, Christ's death is a redemption or ransom; with respect to God it is atonement. God and man are thus reconciled. This is a favorite theme of the Apostle of the

[1] This is the Hebrew conception of God. Compare: "Every knee shall be bowed to me" (*Isaias* 45:24).

[2] For a study of Pauline Christology, see A. C. Cotter in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, VII (1945), 259-90; also J. W. Moran in *AER*, CXX (1949), 463-68. Rationalists who hold that Paul, not Christ, is the founder of Christianity, in general admit that the former taught the divinity of Jesus. This, however, is denied by Charles A. A. Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 270-79.

[3] Cf. also *Eph.* 1:7.

[4] From the words "you know" we see that St. Peter assumes that the recipients of the letter were well acquainted with this truth. Cf. also *I Pet.* 2:9.

Gentiles. "God," he writes, "commends his charity towards us, because when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more now that we are justified by his blood, shall we be saved through him from the wrath. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved by his life" (*Rom.* 5:7-11). "You yourselves were at one time estranged and enemies in mind through your evil works. But now he has reconciled you in his body through his death, to present you holy and irreproachable before him" (*Col.* 1:21-23).

In fact, Modernists assert that the notion of an expiatory death on the part of Christ is exclusively Pauline.[5] This is not true. The doctrine is clearly enunciated by St. Peter. Of Christ he says, "Who, when he was reviled, did not revile, when he suffered, did not threaten, but yielded himself to him who judged him unjustly; who himself bore our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died to sin, might live to justice; and by his stripes you are healed" (*I Pet.* 2:23-25).[6] "Christ also died once for sins, the Just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" (*I Pet.* 3:18).

In *I Cor.* 15:3-9 St. Paul gives us the substance of his preaching.

For I delivered to you first of all, what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas,[7] and after that to the Eleven.[8] Then he was seen by more than five hundred brethren at one time, many of whom are with

---

[5] One of the propositions condemned in the decree *Lamentabili* of Pius X is: *Doctrina de morte piaculari Christi non est evangelica, sed tantum paulina* (*DB*, 2038). Most of the errors condemned in this decree are found in the works of Loisy.

[6] This line is implicitly cited by Polycarp, *To the Philippians*, 81. Found in *Ancient Christian Writers*, VI (Westminster, Md., 1948), 79 f.

[7] St. Peter in his modesty does not tell us this fact, but it is attested by St. Luke. When the two disciples returned from Emmaus, they were greeted with the triumphant cry, "The Lord has risen indeed and has appeared to Simon" (*Luke* 24:34). Peter is always first. In the enumeration of the apostles, his name heads the list (*Matt.* 10:2-5; *Mark* 3:16-20; *Luke* 6:14-17). Peter, James, and John witnessed the Transfiguration (*Matt.* 17:1); to be present with him in his agony, Our Lord selected Peter, James, and John (*Matt.* 26:37).

[8] The apostles were official witnesses of the resurrection. When calling

us still. . . . And last of all, as by one born out of due time, he was seen also by me. . . . Whether then it be I or they; so we preach and so you have believed.

The resurrection is the keystone of the Catholic faith, "For if the dead do not rise, neither has Christ risen; and if Christ has not risen, vain is your faith, for you are still in your sins" (*I Cor.* 15:17).

Hence it is not strange that the Apostle of the Gentiles frequently insisted on these three truths: (1) Christ died; (2) he rose on the third day; (3) this was in accordance with the Scriptures.

Resurrection was a repellent doctrine to the intelligentsia of Athens, but St. Paul preached it to them (*Acts* 17:31). In the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, he said that the Jews in putting Christ to death fulfilled the Scriptures (*Acts* 13:27-32). To both Jews and Gentiles the "stumbling block" was proclaimed.

It was also announced by St. Peter in his first sermon to the Jews, on the day of Pentecost. "Him, when delivered up by the settled purpose and foreknowledge of God, you have crucified and slain by the hands of wicked men. But God raised him up" (*Acts* 2:23). Then he cites *Psalm* 15:8.[9] After his first recorded miracle, the curing of the blind beggar, he stated that God raised up his son (*Acts* 3:26). To the priests, the officer of the temple, and the Saducees, who placed him in custody, he spoke of "Jesus Christ, whom you crucified, whom God has raised from the dead" (*Acts* 4:10).

But besides St. Peter's discourses, we have another source of his doctrine, i.e., his two Letters. In the first of these he writes, "You are believers in God who raised him from the dead and gave him glory" (*I Pet.* 1:21).[10]

---

on the one hundred and twenty persons present in the Upper Room to select another apostle (according to the Scripture), St. Peter laid down this qualification, "Of those men who have been in our company all the time that the Lord Jesus moved among us, from John's baptism until the day when he was taken up from us, of those one must become a witness with us of his resurrection" (*Acts* 1:21-23).

9 Thus the death and resurrection were according to the Scriptures.

10 Compare "he humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God also has exalted him" (*Phil.* 2:8-10).

Salvation is for all and is based on faith. "God our Saviour wishes all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, himself man, who gave himself a ransom for all" (*I Tim.* 2:4-7). Those who are actually saved are the just, and "He who is just lives by faith" (*Rom.* 1:17).[11] This latter theme recurs frequently in the letters of the Apostle of the Gentiles.[12]

In fact, it is a central point in his theology. But it is equally important in the discourses and the epistles of the Prince of the Apostles. He asserts, for instance, "There is no other name under heaven given to men, by which we must be saved" (*Acts* 4:12).

At the Council of Jerusalem, concerning the Gentile converts, he asserted, "God, who knows the heart, bore witness by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith" (*Acts* 15:8-10). "By the power of God you are guarded through faith for salvation. . . . In him you exult with a joy unspeakable and triumphant; receiving as the final issue of your faith, the salvation of your souls" (*I Pet.* 1:5-10).

Here St. Peter seems to say that we earn salvation as a reward. This truth is more clearly stated in his Second Epistle, "Therefore, brethren, strive even more by good works to make your calling and election sure. . . . In this way will be amply provided for you the entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (*II Pet.* 1:10-12).

We need only to make the briefest reference to St. Paul's words on the "just judge" and the "crown of justice" (*II Tim.* 4:6-9).

[11] A few Protestant theologians follow Luther and hold that St. Paul asserted that justification (righteousness) comes from faith alone. "The triumph of the Gospel means justification by faith alone," E. Brunner, *The Divine Imperative* (New York, 1937), p. 64. "Salvation according to Paul was dependent solely on faith," J. G. Machen, *The Origin of St. Paul's Religion* (New York, 1921), p. 284. "Protestantism follows St. Paul in representing the Christian as freed from the law and removed from all questions of merit, being justified by faith alone," Robert S. Franks, *The Atonement* (London, 1934), p. 89. There is no line in St. Paul which asserts that man is justified by faith alone.

[12] For instance, *Rom.* 3:26; 5:1; *Gal.* 2:16; 3:8; 3:11; *Phil.* 3:9.

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

By baptism one enters the Church. This has been the case since the day of Pentecost. At the conclusion of St. Peter's speech on that momentous day the multitude asked, "Brethren, what shall we do? But Peter said to them, 'Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins.' . . . And there were added that day about three thousand souls" (*Acts* 2:37-42).

Paul's experience of baptism left its mark on his whole future life. By it, after instruction, he became a Christian, "and straightway in the synagogues he began to preach that Jesus is the Son of God" (*Acts* 9:20).

On the subject of baptism he dwells at great length, especially in his Epistle to the Romans. This is very significant. The letter was destined for the Church at Rome (*Rom.* 1:7); in other words, to a congregation which the Apostle had not personally evangelized. Yet he takes it for granted that his doctrine was in full accord with that which they had received.[13] The baptism of which he speaks is by immersion, and it not only sanctifies (*Tit.* 3:5; *I Cor.* 6:11), but is rich in symbolism. It is a mystical death. The old man of sin dies, the new man of grace arises from the water. He is buried with Christ, with Christ he rises, into Christ he is engrafted.[14]

Confirmation follows after baptism, and on this point we read an interesting story.

> Paul . . . came to Ephesus and found certain disciples; and he said to them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you became believers?" But they said to him, "We have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit." And he said, "How then were you baptized?" They said, "With John's baptism." . . . On hearing this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them (*Acts* 18:1-8).

---

[13] "Do you not know that all who have been baptized into Jesus have been baptized into his death" (*Rom.* 6:3).

[14] On St. Paul's doctrine on baptism, see W. McGarry, *Paul and the Crucified* (New York, 1939), pp. 180-87; also F. Prat, *La théologie de Saint Paul,* I (20th ed. [Paris, 1930]), 264-68; and I (18th ed. [Paris, 1928]), 306-12.

St. Paul's question shows that one could not be baptized without hearing the words Holy Spirit. The formula "in the name of the Lord Jesus" is a description of Christian baptism, in contradistinction to the baptism of John. The formula of baptism is not found in the New Testament except in *Matt.* 28:19 but the *Didache* describes the baptismal ceremony in great detail.

> Regarding baptism. Baptize as follows: after first explaining all these points, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in running water. But if you have no running water, baptize in other water; and if you cannot in cold, then in warm. But if you have neither, pour water on the head three times in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.[15]

St. Peter confirmed the baptized as we read in *Acts* 8:14-18. Baptism he describes in his First *Epistle* (3:21). Referring to the ark in which were saved Noe, his wife, his sons and their wives, he writes: "Its counterpart, Baptism, now saves you also (not the putting off the filth of the flesh but the inquiry of a good conscience after God), through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

St. Paul is the great exponent of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, and he informs us, "What is lacking of the sufferings of Christ I fill up in my flesh for his body, which is the Church" (*Col.* 1:24). This thought is echoed by St. Peter who tells the Christians that they are "partakers of the sufferings of Christ" (*I Pet.* 4:13).

There are many passages in the letters and speeches of the two apostles that are practically identical. Thus St. Peter writes, "Be subject to every human creature for God's sake, whether to the king as supreme or to governors as sent through him for evildoers. . . . Fear God; honor the king" (*I Pet.* 2:13-18). Well known is St. Paul's request of his converts that "Supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men; for kings,[16] and all in high places" (*I Tim.* 2:1-3). "Let everyone be

[15] *Didache,* VII, *Ancient Christian Writers,* VI (Westminster, Md., 1948), 19. In Chap. 9 we read, "Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist but those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord." Here we have another confirmation of the meaning of baptism in the name of the Lord. It signifies Christian baptism.

[16] Both apostles wrote βασιλεύς, which was the word which the Greeks used for emperor (F. Zorell, *Lexicon graecum Novi Testamenti,* s.v.).

subject to higher authorities, for there exists no authority except from God, and those who exist have been appointed by God (*Rom.* 13:1).

Life in this world is a "tabernacle" (*II Pet.* 1:14); an "earthly house" (*II Cor.* 5:1). Both apostles warn the Christians of those who deceive the faithful for the sake of gain (*II Pet.* 2:3; *Tit.* 1:10-12).

By both St. Peter and St. Paul we have a pen picture of Christ which for brevity and clarity is unsurpassed. "He went about doing good," proclaims St. Peter (*Acts* 10:38); while St. Paul quotes our Saviour as stating, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (*Acts* 20:35).

However, the Apostles differed on one point, or at least on a matter of conduct.

ST. PAUL WITHSTOOD ST. PETER TO HIS FACE

So he informed the Galatians (*Gal.* 2:11). This sentence used to be stressed by those who wished to find an argument against Papal supremacy. The sentence, therefore, demands study.

St. Paul had preached to the Galatians and had reaped an abundant harvest of conversions. Thereupon, Judaizers had arrived from Jerusalem and had taught that all should observe the Mosaic Law in full. They also questioned St. Paul's authority to teach.

In answer, the Apostle presented his credentials. "The gospel which was preached by me is not of man. . . . I received it as a revelation of Jesus Christ" (*Gal.* 1:11-13).

As for the Mosaic Law, it had been abolished. This St. Peter knew from a vision, and he had baptized Gentile converts without circumcision or any mention of the prescriptions of the Law (*Acts* 10). At the Council of Jerusalem, he had asked, "Why then do you now try to test God by putting on the neck of the disciples a yoke which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" (*Acts* 15:10).

But his conduct at times had been inconsistent with his doctrine. He had at first eaten with Gentiles, paying no respect to the prescriptions of the Mosaic Law, as to clean and unclean foods. Later, as St. Paul wrote to his Galatians, "he began to withdraw and to

separate himself, fearing the circumcised, and the rest of the Jews dissembled with him, so that Barnabas[17] was led away by them in that dissimulation" (*Gal.* 2:12-14).

So St. Paul "said to Cephas before them all, 'If thou, though a Jew, live like Gentiles, and not like the Jews, how is it that thou dost compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?'" (*Gal.* 2:14). St. Peter did not defend his conduct. He knew that St. Paul was right on this issue.

And that he acknowledged that his fellow Apostle was right on all issues, we have a striking proof in his two epistles.

The first is to "sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia" (*I Pet.* 1:1). Now Asia and Galatia had been evangelized by St. Paul, yet St. Peter writes as to people who will follow his instructions.

However, from the Second Epistle we have a much more convincing argument. The Prince of the Apostles writes, "Just as our most dear brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given him, has written to you, as indeed he did in all his epistles, speaking of them of these things. In these epistles there are things difficult to understand, which the unlearned and the unstable distort" (*II Pet.* 16).

This is a most significant line. It is only by distorting St. Paul that one can find any dissimilarity between his doctrines and those of his fellow Apostle.

JOHN W. MORAN, S.S.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

[17] This shows the pre-eminence of St. Peter in the early Church. His authority was so great that he influenced the conduct of Barnabas, though the latter was a close companion of St. Paul.

OUR LADY AND THE UNITY OCTAVE

"Let us, then—and we cannot stress it too often—invoke and make known Our Lady of the Atonement as Shepherdess of the Wandering Sheep and Pillar of Unity. Let us never doubt that, by her powerful assistance and with our cooperation she will draw men back into Unity with God and with each other in the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church."[1]

Such was the plea of Father Paul James Francis, S.A., Founder of the Society of the Atonement at Graymoor, New York and Initiator of the Chair of Unity Octave, a worldwide crusade of prayer for Christian Unity. Convinced of Mary's power as cited by the breviary: "*Gaude Virgo Maria, cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo*—Rejoice O Virgin Mary, Thou alone has destroyed all heresies throughout the world," Father Paul sought to share this conviction with others. He desired to bring men to Christ through Mary. He turned to Our Lady in all his ventures so that it was only normal that he should beg her help and protection in the apostolate for the achievement of Christ's prayer: "That all may be one."[2]

As an Episcopalian clergyman, Father Paul called Mary by the title, "Our Lady of the Atonement," and together with Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S.A. (foundress of the Sisters of the Atonement at Graymoor), began the Rosary League under this name on Oct. 7, 1901. In fact the first publication from Graymoor, *Rose Leaves,* was devoted to spreading devotion to the Mother of God for the cause of Unity. Later, when he began the publication of *The Lamp* (February, 1903), Father Paul continued to urge devotion to Mary and in the pulpit he would speak often and eloquently of her glories. In 1908, when his Unity vocation evolved into the formation and promotion of the Chair of Unity Octave as a special period of prayer for Christian Unity, he chose Mary as chief patroness. Deep in his own soul Father Paul believed that

[1] Sermon, feast of Our Lady of the Atonement, July 9, 1930. (Cf. *Lamp,* XXVIII, 10 [Nov. 1930], 321).

[2] For development of this idea see Joseph C. Fenton, "Our Lady and the Extirpation of Heresy," in *Studies in Praise of Our Blessed Mother* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), p. 321.

Mary would reunite the forces that had split from the Mystical Body of her Son. He received substantial proof of her influence in a very personal way when he and his small band of followers entered the One Fold at Graymoor on Oct. 30, 1909.[3]

During the rest of his life Father Paul showed himself an apostle of Unity to an extraordinary degree. He urged men to pray the Octave (January 18-25) and to pray and sacrifice constantly for the reunion of Christendom. His life of mortification and loyalty to the Church was an example for all. But just as prominent was the means that he proposed for this Unity to be realized: devotion to the Mother of God whom he honored under the title "of the Atonement."

Father Paul taught that Mary co-operated in a special way in the salvation of souls because of her unique role in the mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption. For as St. Paul declared that Christ is the "head of the body which is the Church"[4] so Mary is the Mother of the Head and the spiritual Mother of all the members who have been born in the Church, as St. Augustine teaches, because of her love.[5] Centuries ago St. Irenaeus cited Mary's function in the economy of salvation as the *causa salutis*,[6] the cause of salvation, while the writers of nearly every age have noted the Marian role in the world's redemption.

Mary's co-operation with the divine plan was not limited to the Incarnation. She was the associate, the helpmate, the partner with Christ in the entire redemptive work of the Son of God. She heard the angel announce His name Jesus because He would save His people from their sins.[7] She felt ecstatic joy when the aged Simeon took the Child into his arms and cried in a paean of praise: "Now, thou dost dismiss thy servant according to thy word in peace because my eyes have seen thy salvation"[8] but she experienced numbing sorrow when he added: "Thine own soul a sword shall pierce."[9] Later Mary knew the pain of fleeing with her Child into a strange

[3] David Gannon, S.A., *Father Paul of Graymoor* (New York: Macmillan, 1951), pp. 160 ff.
[4] *Eph.* 5:23.
[5] *De sancta virginitate*, VI, 6.
[6] *Adversus haereses*, III, 22, 4 (*MPG*, VII, 1, 959).
[7] *Matt.* 1: 21.
[8] *Luke* 2:29.
[9] *Luke* 2: 35.

country when a petty tyrant sought the life of Him who created the world. Again Our Lady suffered most acutely when she lost her Son in the winding streets of Jerusalem.

Then for eighteen years she, with Jesus and Joseph, retired to the background. But she was present when Jesus began His public life. "They have no wine" she told Him kindly and He responded by working a miracle, to relieve an embarrassed bride and groom. But this love was only a shadow of that charity which filled her soul when she stood valiantly beneath the cross and heard the last bequest of her dying Son: "Woman, behold thy son. . . . Behold thy mother." The sufferings and sorrows of Mary were so completely and inseparably united with those of Jesus that, in the words of Pope Benedict XV: ". . . she suffered and almost died together with her suffering and dying Son . . . in such a manner that we may rightly say that she redeemed the human race together with Christ."[10]

Because Mary had such a prominent role in the mystery of the Atonement, in the whole scheme of man's restoration to friendship and love of God, she is justly called Our Lady of the Atonement.[11] She may also be called Our Lady of Unity, for her function of reconciliation, of uniting men with Christ, did not end with the sacrifice of Calvary. It has continued until the present time and will last until the end of the world, since it is her role as Mother to assist the Saviour in "gathering into one all the children of God." Mary's role is inseparably bound up with the purpose of the Church; she is the Mother of the Head of the Mystical Body and Mother of the members as well. In a frequently quoted passage Pope Pius XII stated:

> It was she who was immune from all sin, personal or inherited, and ever most closely united with her Son, offered Him on Golgotha to the Eternal Father together with the holocaust of her maternal rights and motherly love, like a new Eve, for all the children of Adam, contaminated through his unhappy fall, and thus she, who was Mother of our Head, according to the flesh, became by a title of sorrow and glory the spiritual mother of all His members. She too it was who by her most powerful intercession obtained for the new-born Church the

---

[10] *AAS*, X (1918), 181.

[11] Cf. article, "A New Title for Mary," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXVII, 5 (Nov. 1952), 330-40.

prodigious Pentecostal outpouring of that Spirit of the Divine Redeemer who had already been given on the Cross. She, finally, true Queen of martyrs, by bearing with courageous and confident heart her immense weight of sorrow, more than all Christians, filled up those things that are wanting in the sufferings of Christ, for His body which is the Church.[12]

Our Lady's part in the Mystical Body is to preserve the unity of the members with the Head, to maintain the solidarity of Christ and the faithful and to intercede for those who are outside the Church that they may enter and enjoy the unity that it alone has from God. Mary is more powerful than Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, upon whom Jesus built His Church. She is more loving than the beloved John who merited the special affection of the Master; she is more zealous than the apostolic Paul who roamed the world in search for souls. Mary, the Mother of God and of men, sustains the faithful on their pilgrimage to heaven and she seeks to bring all into the unity of the Church of her Son.

As a modern apostle of unity, Father Paul repeatedly urged the faithful to pray to Our Lady for the salvation of souls. He declared that Our Lady of the Atonement means Our Lady of the At-one-ment or Our Lady of Unity; he was convinced that Mary would win the world for Christ. "Satan, by fomenting strife and fostering heresies and schisms," he asserted, "has separated many millions from the unity of the Church . . . but Our Lady of the Atonement will yet crush the serpent's head even where he has, until now, achieved his greatest victories."[13] He went on to explain:

> Through her all prevailing intercession, the Holy Spirit will bring about such a world-wide movement of dissident Christians to the center of Catholic Unity that the return of the Wandering Sheep to communion with the Apostolic See will far transcend in magnitude and importance the lapse of the Greeks from Unity in the tenth century and the Protestant defection in the sixteenth combined. We dare to make this prophecy not because we have the vision of the Seer but because we believe that God the Father Almighty will answer the prayer of His Son, Jesus Christ, and Our Lady of the Atonement will have a leading part to play in this glorious accomplishment.[14]

---

[12] *AAS*, XXXV, 247-48.
[13] *Lamp*, XXI, 2 (March, 1926), 93.
[14] *Ibid.*

At another time Father Paul explained his notion of the Blessed Virgin as Our Lady of the Atonement in this way. She is the symbol of the unity which men should enjoy with their God. "When we . . . give to Our Blessed Mother the title of Our Lady of the Atonement we mean: Our Lady of Unity. As she sits enthroned she represents to the universe the highest possible approach of a creature to intimate and exalted union with God. . . . But Our Lady of the Atonement is not alone the Mother of God, she is also the New Eve, the Mother of redeemed mankind; she is the center of that family unity which Christ prayed and willed might flourish among His sons and daughters of the Atonement."[15]

As founder of the Unity Octave, Father Paul followed the principle of Bl. Pius X: "There is no easier or surer way of uniting men to Christ than Mary."[16] He urged the faithful to recite the Rosary daily during the Octave, or at least one decade of it, for the cause of unity. He seemed to suggest that this time of concerted prayer would be effective in direct proportion to man's devotion to the Mother of God. Perhaps he recalled St. Dominic and his success in conquering heresy in the thirteenth century by means of the Rosary and he thought that this crusade of prayer for the defeat of heresy and schism would be effective through prayer to Mary and especially the Rosary. He asked the faithful to have recourse to Mary in these words:

> Let us look up to her all radiant on her throne, our beautiful Mother of the Atonement apparelled in the crimson robe of the Precious Blood, interceding at this moment for the great At-one-ment; and may we never cease to unite our prayers with hers that the scales may fall away from the eyes of our separated brethren and they may understand that the Great Shepherd whom Our Father appointed as His Vicegerent on earth is *their* father and *their* shepherd.[17]

The Chair of Unity Octave always lends itself to a special emphasis of Mary's part in the salvation and sanctification of men. For Our Lady is the Refuge of Sinners, the Help of Christians, the Mother of Mercy. She desires the salvation of a soul even more than the person himself. And surely this Marian Year of 1954 should inspire an even greater devotion than previous times. Pope

[15] *Ibid.*, XXIV, 1 (Feb. 1926), 60.
[16] *Ad diem illum* (*ASS*, XXXVI [1904], 542).
[17] *Lamp*, XXVIII, 10 (Nov. 1930), 323.

Pius XII has made a special appeal to those separated from the Church in the magnificent encyclical announcing the event. To the schismatics he said: "We call on those who are separated from us by an ancient schism and whom nonetheless we love with paternal affection, to unite in pouring forth these joint prayers and supplications, knowing full well how greatly they venerate the Mother of Jesus Christ and celebrate her Immaculate Conception."[18] To the Protestants he made this appeal: "May the same Blessed Virgin look down on all those who are proud to call themselves Christians, and who, being united at least by the bond of charity, humbly raise to her their eyes, their minds, and their prayers, imploring that light which illumines the mind with heavenly rays, and begging for that unity by which at last there may be one fold and one shepherd."[19]

Since the Holy Father has made special mention of these "separated brethren" in his document on the Marian Year, it seems fitting to consider the various intentions of the Chair of Unity Octave in reference to the Blessed Virgin. No one, except God, more ardently desires the conversion of the world and the unity of all men in the One Church than our Blessed Lady.

JANUARY 18: THE FEAST OF THE CHAIR OF ST. PETER AT ROME: THE RETURN OF ALL THE "OTHER SHEEP" TO THE ONE FOLD OF ST. PETER, THE ONE SHEPHERD

On this opening day of the Chair of Unity Octave, the Church celebrates the feast of St. Peter to whom was first confided the primacy and supremacy as the Vicar of Christ. This feast was re-established by Pope Paul IV in 1558 to emphasize the authority and the primacy of the Papacy, after the Protestants tried to show that St. Peter never lived or died in Rome.[20] This feast providentially stressed the role of St. Peter as Christ's Vicar on earth and it symbolizes the unity of the Church and the authority which St. Peter and his successors received from God.

Humanly speaking, prayer for the unity of all men in the true Church seems fantastic; it seems an unattainable goal. For there are more than two billion people on the earth; more than half of

[18] *Fulgens corona gloriae,* Sept. 8, 1953.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] A. Gueranger, *Liturgical Year* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1948), III, 317.

these are not Christian in any form, while seven hundred million who call themselves Christians are not members of the true Church. Moreover, the great plan of converting the world has been going on for nearly two thousand years and it is still so far from realization. How can unity come? How will Christ's prayer be answered? Is it not foolish even to dream of such a gigantic venture? But this is not a human goal at stake; it does not depend on the flimsy means of human thought and action; it is founded on sacrifice and prayer and grace.

The Blessed Mother of God can conquer souls for her Son. She dispenses the grace by which men come to know and love Him and the grace by which the faithful become zealous apostles fired with the desire of winning souls. As the late Bishop Francis X. Ford, heroic missioner in China, said: "Our Blessed Mother wants us to share anxiety for the conversion of the world . . . she wants us to carry about with us in our daily work this deep anxiety for the conversion of souls, and a corresponding generosity in offering reparation for the sins of the world. . . . Our hearts must be like the Heart of Mary: anxious, yearning for the conversion of all people."[21]

Though the problem is staggering and the task seem impossible, the gentle but powerful influence of Mary will overcome the forces of evil and of disunity. Mary is not only the humble Maid of Nazareth, but the woman clothed with the sun, formidable as an army ready for battle—she will vanquish the powers of hell and win souls to Christ. As Pope Pius XI declared: "May Mary, the most holy Queen of the Apostles, graciously second our common undertakings; Mary, who since as she holds in her mother's heart all men who were committed to her on Calvary, cherishes and loves, not only those who happily enjoy the fruits of the Redemption, but those likewise who still do not know that they have been redeemed by Jesus Christ."[22]

If all the faithful took an active interest in the Octave what a powerful wave of grace would sweep over the world! Or as Bishop Ford wrote: "If the Catholics throughout the world . . . were to redouble their prayers for the conversion of those outside the fold,

[21] Bp. Raymond Lane, *Stone in the King's Highway* (New York: McMullen, 1953), p. 253.

[22] *Rerum ecclesiae* (*AAS*, XVIII [1926], 83).

the united prayers that would storm heaven would without doubt mark the year as a Pentecostal renewal. Our participation in this octave will at least enlarge our viewpoint, broaden our charity, and make us see in every man a brother whom Christ is yearning to welcome to His sacraments."[23]

JANUARY 19: THE RETURN OF ALL ORIENTAL DISSIDENTS TO COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE

On this second day of the Unity Octave our prayers are for a special group cut off from the Church, but united to her in many ways. These dissidents of the East who can trace their spiritual lineage to Ignatius of Antioch, John Chrysostom, the two Gregorys, John Damascene and so many other illustrious saints, have the seven sacraments and the Mass; they have bishops and priests with valid orders. They treasure a deep devotion to the Mother of God, but they lack the fulness of love because they reject the oneness of government and authority in the Holy Father.

Among the so-called Orthodox there are many manifestations of love for Mary. The icon of Our Lady of Perpetual Help, Byzantine in style, is the most popular representation of Mary in the Near East and before the Bolsheviks and Communists defamed her image it was most widely venerated in "Holy Russia." Despite the suffering and persecution of the present hour an ardent love for Mary lives on in the hearts of the Russian people and of others enslaved by the same oppressor, with smuggled pictures and hidden icons that testify to a love that cannot be uprooted by force. The flames now concealed will burst forth again and the *Bogoroditza* (She-who-gave-birth-to-God) will once more reign as Queen and Mother.

Even in the Kremlin there is a church building dedicated to Mary under the title of the Assumption. Assuredly it is not used for divine services today, but in the future it will again re-echo the prayers and hymns in honor of the Mother of God and the prophecy of a holy priest and Apostle of Mary, Maximilian Kolbe, O.F.M.Conv., will be fulfilled: "One day you will see the statue of the Immaculate atop the Kremlin."[24]

[23] Lane, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

[24] M. Kiwanaska, *Our Lady's Fool* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1952), p. 120.

When the Catholics of Zhotimir, Russia, asked Pope Leo XIII for a copy of the most popular picture of Our Lady in Rome, the Pontiff sent a copy of the picture of Our Lady of Perpetual Help. He likewise made it the official seal of the Pontifical Mission for Russia. The same inscription is used as the cover of a publication, *Balcan,* devoted to the study of Christian Unity; it adorns the walls of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Rome, an inspiration for the Europeans and Asiatics who gather there to discuss plans for reunion.

In 1931 Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical, *Lux veritatis,* on the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus. His reference to Our Lady at the end of the document is most appropriate at the present time:

> Under the auspices of the heavenly Queen, We desire all to beg for a very special favor of the greatest importance, that she who is loved and venerated with such ardent piety by the people of the East, may not permit that they should be unhappily wandering and still kept apart from the unity of the Church, and thus from her Son, whose vicar We are. . . . Would, moreover, that very soon the happiest of days might dawn when the Virgin Mother of God, looking through her image so exquisitely worked in mosaic under Our Predecessor, Sixtus III, in the Liberian Basilica, and restored by Us to its original beauty, would see the separated children returning to venerate her with Us with one mind and one faith![25]

JANUARY 20: THE SUBMISSION OF THE ANGLICANS TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE VICAR OF CHRIST

Prior to its separation from Rome in the sixteenth century England was so devoted to Our Lady as to merit the title, "Dowry of Mary." Its valleys and hillsides were dotted with her shrines; its people vied with each other in giving precious gifts to her altars. Every county and diocese abounded with prominent places of devotion: Canterbury, Ely, Lincoln, Worcester, York, and hundreds more. But most celebrated of all was Walsingham where even members of the nobility went in pilgrimage to honor the Mother of God.[26]

King Edward III dedicated the kingdom to Mary as her dowry

[25] *Lux veritatis,* Dec. 25, 1931 (*AAS,* XXIII, 515).
[26] H. M. Gillet, *Walsingham* (London: Burns, Oates, 1950), p. 37.

forever, and his grandson, Richard II, confirmed the gift. In the English College at Rome there is an ancient painting showing Richard and his queen on their knees offering, through the hands of St. John, their country to the Blessed Virgin. Below are inscribed the words: "*Dos tua, Virgo pia, haec est; quare rege Maria*—This, O holy Virgin, is thy dowry; do thou, O Mary, reign over us."

But England's devotion to Our Lady is, for the most part, a thing of the past. Sadly enough, one of the greatest devotees of Walsingham was Henry VIII;[27] no king of England ever began his reign with greater devotion to this shrine than he who later plundered it and stripped its sanctuary of its gems and precious metals. The lone wall that starkly stands today is mute reminder of what a man did because he cast aside the love of the Mother of God. For more than three hundred years the faith was nearly stifled and devotion to Mary lay hidden, almost buried, in the hearts of a few faithful. But during the last century the Church began its re-conversion of the English nation and it seems that the ancient prophecy is nearing fulfillment: "When England returns to Walsingham, then Mary will return to England."

For England is returning. The movement is gradual, but constant and steadily growing; each year sees an increase in conversions so that the Second Spring of which Newman spoke seems to have begun. With his sentiment men can pray to Mary: "Arise, and go forth in thy strength into that north country which once was thine own, and take possession of a land which knows thee not. From thy sweet eyes, from thy pure smile, from thy majestic brow, let ten thousand influences rain down, not to confound or overwhelm, but to persuade, to win over thine enemies. O Mary, my hope, O Mother undefiled, fulfill to us the promise of this Spring."[28]

But our prayer is not alone for the Anglicans of England, whether they be "high, low, or broad" but for all who belong to this communion in America, Canada, India, and other parts of the world. It is a prayer to Our Lady which Pope Leo XIII first sent to England nearly sixty years ago:

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] Daniel O'Connell, *Favorite Newman Sermons* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1932), pp. 24 f.

O Blessed Mother of God and our most gentle Queen and Mother, look down in mercy upon England thy dowry and upon all who gently hope and trust in thee. By thee Jesus our Saviour and our help was given to the world; and He has given thee to us that we might hope still more. Plead for us, thy children, whom thou didst receive and accept at the foot of the Cross. O Sorrowful Mother! intercede for our separated brethren that they may be united with us in the one fold of the supreme shepherd, the Vicar of thy Son. Pray for us, dear Mother, that by faith fruitful in good works we may all deserve to see and praise God together with thee in our heavenly home.[29]

JANUARY 21: THAT THE LUTHERANS AND ALL OTHER PROTESTANTS OF CONTINENTAL EUROPE MAY FIND THEIR WAY BACK TO HOLY CHURCH

There is little to be gained in criticizing Martin Luther today. Rather men should pray that those who follow him may come to a realization of the gift that he, and those who follow him, flung aside: veneration for the Mother of God. As a young priest Luther wrote and preached beautiful tributes to Mary. Even after he nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of Wittenburg's Cathedral and turned his back on his Lord, he wrote in a commentary on the Magnificat: "If I had as many tongues as there are stars in the sky or grains of sand on the seashore, or leaves of all the forests, and if with all these tongues I did nothing but praise Mary day and night, I could never say anything half so glorious to her as that which is expressed in the single phrase: 'Thou art the Mother of God.' "[30]

In a short while he repudiated Our Lady too, but among his followers devotion to the Virgin did not die so quickly. In many places in the sixteenth century the Lutherans continued to celebrate the feast of the Assumption with meetings and canticles because the people would not give up the festival. At the present day many still demonstrate love for Mary by reciting the Rosary and there

[29] *ASS*, XXVII (1895), 593.

[30] *Die Erklarung des Magnificat* of 1521. He was excommunicated by Pope Leo X by the bull *Decet Romanum Pontificem* (Jan. 3, 1521). Elsewhere Luther wrote thus of Our Lady: "Mary sees herself, lifted above all men, and yet remains simple and unperturbed. At every moment this heart of Mary remains firm and ever the same, allowing God to work in her according to His will. This is the way we ought to be and were we, what a true Magnificat would be sung! What dearer thing could befall her, do

has been a notable increase of Marian devotion, especially in the Evangelical Church of Mainz.

During the Holy Year of 1950 a Lutheran minister, Richard Baumann, made a pilgrimage to Rome. In writing of his experiences he frequently alluded to the Blessed Virgin. Of the Rosary he said: ". . . when the rosary is said, truth sinks into the subconscious like a slow and steady downpour, the hammered sentences of the catechism receive an indelible validity for precisely the little ones. . . ."[31] He made special note of the fact that the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church use the following phrases: "Mary, the pure, the holy, the ever-virgin, the God-Bearer, truly the Mother of God, worthy of the amplest praises. She wills that we follow her example. She prays for the Church."[32]

For the first time in four hundred years the sons of St. Francis have returned to Norway. The land that produced its St. Olaf and St. Magnus, its St. Hallvard and St. Eyestein is beginning to re-echo with the liturgy of the Church and its Aves in honor of the Mother of God. St. Canute of Denmark will live in other sons of the Church and St. Bridget and St. Catherine of Sweden will rise once more as modern heroines of God's family, if only a sufficient number of missioners will take the torch of faith and carry it full-flaming among men who know it not. In the prayer of the famous Barnabite priest, Fr. Karl Schilling, who labored so extensively for the conversion of the Scandinavian people, we ask divine blessings:

---

you think?—than through her you should come to God, and by her example learn to trust and hope in Him, even if you be despised and made naught in life and death. She would be and fain would be the most eminent example of God's grace, that she might rouse all the world to utter reliance on the divine mercy, to its love and praise. From her all hearers should win such confidence in God that with full assurance they could say: Ah, thou blissful maiden and Mother of God, how great a solace has God shown us in thee: that, as we see in thy regard, also us poor and wretched men he will not despise but look on us graciously." In R. Baumann, *To See Peter* (New York: McKay, 1953), pp. 21 f.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[32] *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelish-lutherischen Kirche* (ed. Müller-Kolde, Gütersloh, 1912), *passim*. Further evidence of Protestant veneration of Mary can be found in R. Schimmelpfennig, *Geschichte der marienverehrung im deutschen Protestantismus* (Paderborn, 1952).

Good Jesus, I humbly fall at Thy feet and pray Thee by Thy holy wounds and by Thy Precious Blood which Thou hast shed for the whole world, to look in mercy upon the Scandinavian people. Led astray hundreds of years ago, they are now separated from Thy Church and denied the inestimable benefit of the Sacrament of Thy Body and Blood, and also the many other means of grace which Thou hast instituted for the consolation of the faithful in life and in death.

Remember, O Saviour of the world, that for these souls also Thou didst shed Thy Precious Blood and endure untold sufferings.

Good Shepherd, lead these Thy sheep back to the wholesome pastures of Thy Church, so that they may be one flock together with us under Thy Vicar here on earth—the Bishop of Rome, who in the person of the Holy Apostle Peter was commissioned by Thee to care both for the lambs and for the sheep.

Hear, O merciful Jesus, these our petitions, which we make to Thee with full trust in the love of Thy Sacred Heart towards us, and to Thy Holy Name be glory, honor, and praise through all eternity.[33]

JANUARY 21: THAT CHRISTIANS IN AMERICA MAY BECOME ONE IN COMMUNION WITH THE CHAIR OF ST. PETER

The object of prayer for this day should be especially dear to all the faithful in the United States. Our own land, dedicated to the Mother of God under the title of the Immaculate Conception, should be noted for its love for Mary. To some extent, it is true, this love has been shown, from the coming of Christopher Columbus in his *Santa Maria* to the Rosary Rallies, the widespread Legion of Mary and Sodality organizations of the present day. But such tribute is not complete. Mary seeks the souls of all in America, of all the members of more than three hundred sects cut off from the Church.

If the Catholic laity of our nation were imbued with the dignity and glory of their vocation as lay apostles, what tremendous strides the Church would make! If each Catholic brought just one soul a year to the Church, in five years all America would be Catholic. True, this is idealistic, but it is surely a goal worthy of sacrifice and prayer.

There has been no appreciable change of attitude towards the Church in this country. The attacks today are fundamentally the same as they were a century ago, but here and there admiration

[33] Quoted by Sigrid Undset, *Saga of Saints* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935), pp. 311 f.

bespeaks an interest in things Catholic and under the aegis of grace, admiration can lead to conversion. For example, a Methodist minister in Brooklyn said two years ago:

> I like Roman Catholicism because it is the mother Church. The bulk of our traditions have been preserved by this great institution. I like Roman Catholicism because it is Catholic, it is a Church militant which always has had a passion for souls. I like Roman Catholicism for its discipline. In this day when we are discovering how important to health and happiness is peace of mind, it is well to re-examine the basic principles of confession. I like Roman Catholicism, most of all, for its realism. It is one Christian Church which takes itself most seriously. When a Roman communicant comes to Mass, he comes to the presence of Christ. There is no room in his faith for any doubt of this reality.[34]

Unfortunately, one of the chief difficulties for the Protestant mind is devotion to the Mother of God. But even in this matter patience and charity can do much to dispel the spiritual iron curtain with which so many have surrounded themselves. The faithful must pray for those who are not members of the Church and be ready apostles in explaining the faith whenever they have the opportunity.

The forums, the trailer chapels, the information centers, all are valuable means of bringing souls to the faith; while the efforts, at times heroic, of priests, Brothers and Sisters laboring in the vast areas of the south and west have wrought incalculable results. But these are not the only missions to the non-Catholic. In our large cities there are thousands and millions who do not have the true faith. How will they be converted? When? By whom? In the providence of God it seems that the principal way of bringing souls to Christ is the humble unheralded activity of lay Catholics, conscious of their duty and dignity in spreading the faith. Any sphere of activity, any walk of life, any circumstance can be significant. There is a story told of a little Sister who won a convert simply because she signed "God bless you" in a business letter. Countless others awaken the first interest in the faith by a kind act, a smile, a courteous gesture. There are so many possibilities of apostolic action for those who love Christ and His Mother.

[34] Rev. Arthur O. Achenbom, "Why I Like Roman Catholicism," reprinted in *The Tablet* (Brooklyn), Aug. 18, 1951.

JANUARY 23: THE RETURN TO THE SACRAMENTS OF LAPSED CATHOLICS

This intention has a note of urgency and tragedy about it. These souls, fallen from God's grace and living in sin, were born into the supernatural life. They were once members of Christ who knew the power and love of God in the sacraments, especially in the Eucharist, and quickened under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation. They once loved their spiritual Mother Mary who directed their paths and heeded their lisping Aves.

But all that is past. Once heirs of paradise, they have foresaken their destiny for the "mess of pottage" of personal ambition, of material success, or of an unlawful marriage. But just as the Divine Shepherd seeks for the lost, so Mary, the Divine Shepherdess, by her prayers and love seeks for those who have separated themselves from the Church. Mary longs to bring them back, she desires to welcome them once more in their home.

How many souls have returned to the practice of their faith by the persistent devotion of some old mother, of a faithful wife, of a fervent religious? How many have returned, after years of separation, because they were faithful, for no reason they could explain, to some little practice of devotion to Mary? Their number is legion; every soul that comes back in repentance, every heart that is stung by remorse, every shoulder bowed with grief, is a constant memorial to the mother love of the Blessed Virgin.

There is a story of Mary's influence over one of her "straying children." A priest was called to the slum section of an eastern city. Dirty-faced urchins met him on the sidewalk and led him to the dank cellar of a foul-smelling tenement. There beside the furnace, in a welter of soiled underwear, empty bottles, and cigarette butts, on a rusty cot lay a woman wrapped in a man's overcoat. She groaned in intense pain. The eldest of the children, a girl of eleven, said: "Here's a priest to see you." The woman turned and screamed: "Get out of here!" Then someone dragged over an empty beer case and the priest sat on it beside the cot. He spoke kindly to the woman, telling her that she was dying and it was time for her to make her peace with God. She continued to call him the foulest names. Finally the priest knelt and in a low voice began the Rosary. At first it was an odd combination of prayer and blasphemy, but as the Hail Marys continued the woman

became silent; tears filled her bloodshot eyes. As she said later, when the priest said the Rosary, memories came back to her—memories of her girlhood in the midwest, of her mother and father, of her brothers and sisters . . . of herself . . . all kneeling around the dining room table saying the Rosary before the May shrine of Our Lady with a little white candle burning before it. She had been so good then; she was so evil now. At the last decade she answered the priest: "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death." She went to confession, received the Eucharist, and died peacefully.

JANUARY 24: THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS

This intention must appeal to Our Lady in a special way, for she, no less than her divine Son, was a member of the Jewish race. She knew the hopes and desires of her people, of their longing for the Saviour who would grant them freedom. Mary's pure lips could utter words that no other creature dared to say: "My soul doth magnify the Lord . . . all nations shall call me blessed because he that is mighty hath done great things unto me."[35]

One of the most poignant scenes from the Gospels shows Mary and Joseph seeking their lost Son who had wandered from them when they began their trip home from Jerusalem. Both thought the Child was with the other, or with relatives. Then came the tragic realization that He was with neither. Back to Jerusalem they hurried and sought Him in the jungle of the dark narrow streets, heedless of fatigue or hunger or of any need whatever—except that of finding Christ.

On the third day they found Him in the temple. In its pillared halls the teachers sat on low stools, while round them gathered those desiring to hear the lectures. In the center was the Child, listening to their statements and answering questions. Surprised and relieved, Mary asked simply: "Son, why hast thou done so to us? Behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing."

". . . I have sought thee sorrowing." How aptly the words apply to the members of the Jewish race of which Mary was the purest flower. Mary is not only the Lily of Israel in the sense of being the fairest of the chosen people, immaculate, but because she bears

[35] *Luke* 1:46, 49.

a special relationship to the Israelites and seeks with all a Mother's love to bring them to the Church of her Son.

There is a story told of a Jewish woman in Vienna who used to visit the Catholic Church, but only because of its art; she was especially attracted to a picture of the Sorrowful Mother. During the Nazi reign of terror in 1938 she was forced to clean a house occupied by the Storm Troopers. Locked in a room she had to scrub the floor with lye and steel wool. Soon her hands began to smart and then to bleed. Suddenly she heard a piercing scream, such a shriek as she never heard before—a creature crying for freedom. At once she understood the meaning of that image of the Sorrowful Mother: "I have sought thee sorrowing." She saw that in all who are united to Christ, His life and Passion are reflected and repeated so that all suffering borne of love makes the soul Christ-like and serves in His redemptive work. The woman's hands were bleeding, but her heart was full of joy. Grace had struck with marvelous force. The next day she went to the Church of the Sorrowful Mother and asked to become a Catholic.

The same glorious Mother of God, standing by the Cross of Christ and interceding for the unity of all men, gives hope and courage to all the world. Mary worked a miracle with blinding light upon Alphonse Ratisbonne in Rome in the Church of Santa Andrea della Fratte in 1842 and brought him to his knees and to the priesthood of Jesus. Though Our Lady does not work a miracle to remove the walled obstacles to her love, still her influence is most effective. Mary is the Mother of the Jewish people and with her there is neither bond nor free, neither Jew nor gentile—all are one.

JANUARY 25: THE FEAST OF THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL: THE MISSIONARY CONQUEST OF THE WORLD FOR CHRIST

On this glorious feast of the Apostle our minds think of God's grace as it fairly flung Saul to the ground on his way to Damascus, and of its effect upon him and upon the entire Church. Miracles are unusual; they are not the ordinary way. But the unmistakable lesson is here: God's grace can overcome the proud intellect and the stubborn will, but someone must pray. In the case of St. Paul perhaps Our Lady was praying for him; surely she was praying for the good of the Church when the voice from the clouds spoke to the stricken man: "Saul, Saul, why persecuteth thou Me?"

When we consider the millions of souls who have absolutely no contact with Christianity, even in its most distorted forms, who do not know the mercy of Christ or the Mother-love of Mary, we are appalled by the difficulty of converting them. But in words adapted from the votive Mass of the Propagation of the Faith, we must pray: "O Mother of God, who willest that all men should be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth, send, we beseech thee, laborers to the harvest of thy Son; grant them to speak the truth with all confidence, that the message of God may spread and be made known and that all people may know thee and thy Son. . . ."

Missioners in foreign lands report the devotion of many non-Catholic people to Our Lady. It is not a Catholic veneration, of course, but it is genuine and sincere. Perhaps in the providence of God this respect for Our Lady will be the bridge whereby millions will enter the Church of Christ. At the boundaries of Nepal in India three thousand Hindus and Moslems joined three hundred Catholics to honor the Pilgrim Statue of Our Lady of Fatima, as four elephants carried the statue to the church for the Rosary and Benediction. At Rojkot, with practically no Catholics, unbelieving ministers of the state and other officials came to venerate the statute. The mayor of Nadiad read a speech of welcome and declared how proud he was to be present. For twelve hours crowds passed through the church, crowds that were mostly non-Christian. As one old Indian expressed it: "She has shown us that your religion is sincere; it is not like ours. Your religion is a religion of love; ours is one of fear."[36]

The passing of the Pilgrim Statue was like a triumphant march. At Patna, the Brahman governor visited the Catholic Church and prayed before the statue. In the tiny village of Kesra Mec more than twenty-five thousand people came to view the statue and the Rajah sent 250 rupees and his wife a petition of prayers. In other parts of India, and in Africa too, Moslems crowded the churches to render homage to the Mother of God.

Moslemism has, in fact, many references to Mary. In the Koran there are several mentions of Mary, the Annunciation, the Visita-

[36] Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, *The World's First Love* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952), pp. 193 f.

tion, and the Nativity. Angels are shown accompanying the Virgin and saying: "Oh Mary, God has chosen you and purified you and elected you above all the women of the earth." It is said too that the Moslems believe in the Immaculate Conception and the Virgin Birth.

Many other instances might be cited which seem to indicate that "The Age of Mary" of which Grignion de Montfort spoke, has begun. Surely the increased societies and works in her honor, the new theological studies, the emphasis given to her role in the economy of salvation and sanctification lead one to believe that this era has been initiated. St. Grignion spoke of the glorification of Mary in these terms:

> Mary must shine forth more than ever in mercy, in might, and in grace in these latter times; in mercy, to bring back and lovingly receive the poor strayed sinners who shall be converted and shall return to the Catholic Church; in might, against the enemies of God . . . who shall rise in terrible revolt against God to seduce all who shall be contrary to them, and to make them fall by promises and threats; and finally she must shine forth in grace, in order to animate and sustain the valiant soldiers and faithful servants of Jesus Christ who shall battle for His interests.[37]

CONCLUSION

No saint in heaven is more concerned with the salvation of men than Mary. Nor is any saint or angel as powerful as the benign Mother of God. As Bl. Pius X wrote fifty years ago: ". . . no one is more powerful than the Virgin for uniting men with Christ. No one ever knew Christ so profoundly as she knew him and no one can be a more competent guide and teacher for knowing Christ. . . . There is no surer or easier way than Mary for uniting all men with Christ."[38]

In this spirit of confidence and love we invoke Mary during the Chair of Unity Octave. We know of Mary's strength in throwing back the forces of evil; we now ask her to cast aside the treacherous forces seeking to enslave men's souls. We ask Mary to give new impetus to the preaching and teaching of missionaries; to make all the faithful zealous for the salvation of souls; to win back those

[37] *True Devotion* (Bay Shore, N. Y.: Montfort Fathers, 1950), pp. 33 f.
[38] *ASS*, XXXVI, 452.

who have strayed from the faith; to win over those who are opposed to it. We realize the truth of the words of St. Cyril of Alexandria: "Through you the Apostles preached salvation to the nations . . . through you the precious cross is honored and adored throughout the world; through you every person who was held by the error of idolatry is led back to recognize the truth; through you the faithful have come to holy baptism and the Church has been founded in every nation."[39]

Indeed this Unity Octave of prayer for the world's conversion should be observed with special fervor during this Marian Year. It is a privilege to live at such a period in the Church's history; but there is also the duty of making Mary known and loved so that souls may come to Christ. As Pope Leo XIII wrote several decades past: "Nor will he seem to be exaggerating who asserts that chiefly through Mary's leadership and help the wisdom and teaching of the Gospel spread so rapidly to every nation in spite of difficulties and cruel persecutions and brought everywhere a new order of justice and peace."[40]

Thus the purpose of the Unity Octave can be sought through the intercessory power of Mary. We do not know what will become of the various ecumenical movements outside the Church, whether they will find their *terminus* in the One Fold, but we can be certain that if men pray to Mary for the grace of reunion, she will not be deaf to their pleas. Indeed the work of extending the Church and of winning souls demands not only dedication to Christ but consecration to Mary, for she is inseparable from Her Son and His Mystical Body. Father Paul gives the norm in these words: "When we address Our Blessed Mother under the beautiful title [Our Lady of the Atonement] let us think of her as 'Our Lady of Unity' and let us consecrate ourselves afresh at her altar to contribute what lies within our power of prayer, sacrifice, and charitable endeavor to bring our Separated Brethren into the unity of the One Fold under the One Shepherd.[41]

TITUS CRANNY, S.A.

Atonement Seminary
Washington, D. C.

[39] *Hom. contra Nestorium* (*MPG*, LXXVII, 992).
[40] *Adjutricem populi* (*ASS*, XXVIII, 131).
[41] *Lamp*, XXI, 2 (March, 1926), 93.

MUINTIR-NA-TIRE

More than a quarter of a century has seen Ireland politically free yet far from being emancipated from many of the false economic and social ideals associated with the old regime. These latter are, indeed, still so gravely in evidence that an Irish priest, recognised as one of the most astute authorities on the commercial and social life of the country, felt justified quite recently in saying: "In thirty years of freedom we have not gone on our traditional Christian way of life. Instead of being a light to guide others we have followed slavishly the ways of the nations for whom we hoped we would be a guide. We have seen failure and have measured everything by the yardstick of materialism."

Of this remnant of foreign influence over the national mind one of the most serious features is the tendency, especially during the last two decades, of people to look inordinately to the state for economic and social assistance. So pronounced is this trend that the Catholic Hierarchy has in recent years felt compelled to issue warnings that therein lies the path to the Socialist State, now frequently disguised as the Welfare State, which demands for its favors the surrender of family and individual rights that are of the essence of true freedom.

The false outlook which stems from the days of British rule is not, however, the sole trouble in the economic and social life of the nation. The marked industrial expansion which has come with independence to the country has led to an unwholesome flight from the land to urban areas. This exodus from the countryside is causing considerable damage to the national economy and threatening to deprive rural Ireland of the most distinctive and fascinating features of its life.

To counteract these unwholesome things, Father Hayes, parish priest of Bansha, County Tipperary, decided some years ago to found a rural movement known as Muintir-na-Tire. Through this institution he hopes to have some day an agency with branches in every part of the country capable of effecting a nationwide social revolution and an economic revival in accord with Christian principles.

To attain this end Muintir-na-Tire uses the parish as its unit of operation and has decreed that this unit must never submit to state control or, indeed, to any form of centralised authority. Within the parish a Council is formed to carry out surveys of parochial agricultural needs and to study the existing schemes in order to determine the manner of meeting these needs. This body, too, is supposed to impress on farmers the value of agricultural enlightenment through the medium of lectures, films, classes and discussion groups.

This Parish Plan, it is of interest to note, has won the high approval of the international organisation known as the O.E.E.C. (Organisation of European Economic Co-operation). The report of this body on Agricultural Advisory Services in European countries has these complimentary things to say of the Irish movement. "The new Parish Plan," it states, "instituted with the support of the Ministry, is the most forward step in the improvement of agricultural advisory services in Europe. Wisely directed it should greatly improve the economic conditions of farmers as well as the social conditions in the several communities."

The work of the Parish Plan clearly shows that Muintir-na-Tire is very methodic and painstaking in its endeavor to build up a sense of independence and responsibility amongst rural people, to stimulate individual initiative and pride in local achievement and to create that community life inspired by charity which is the kernel of the message of all the great social encyclicals. No better measures than these could it take to stem the advance of urbanisation against rural Ireland and turn the mind of the countryman from those ways which tend to barter freedom for the assistance of the Welfare State.

The Muintir-na-Tire movement was considerably strengthened about three years ago by finding a helper in the noted scholar and social worker, Dr. Alfred O'Rahilly, President of University College, Cork. Through his influence this constituent college of the National University decided to extend to agricultural workers a two-year course in rural science leading to a diploma. As a result farmers and farm labourers are now attending in three small towns classes in Sociology, Rural Economics, Farm Accounts, Woodwork, Farm Building, Metalwork and Farm Engineering.

Countrywomen, too, have been favoured by the same institution with a diploma course in Social and Home Science.

All these activities of Muintir-na-Tire have so captured the admiration of the country that the movement can now boast of 320 guilds. These parish associations would have been much more numerous but for the fact that the extension of centers for courses in agricultural science is considerably hampered by the difficulty in finding for this purpose suitable accommodation and teaching staffs. In time, however, this problem will be much less acute as young men with diplomas become available as instructors.

In the light of the fine work being accomplished by this movement it is no wonder that political leaders, economists, and sociologists of note have acclaimed it as one of the most welcome developments in modern Ireland. High praise, too, has been given to it by several members of the Hierarchy, one of whom never fails to be present to give it words of encouragement during its annual National Week.

Nor is the good reputation of this rural movement confined to the shores of Ireland. A recent Muintir-na-Tire Week in a small provincial town has been visited by prominent social and economic workers from the United States, England, the West Indies, Germany, Sweden, and Australia. Amongst these visitors was an Australian priest who had studied the methods of several educational centers in Europe and America devoted to the solution of rural problems. From him came the tribute that the constructive work of Muintir-na-Tire was the best and most practical he had encountered. But what this movement prizes most is the deep interest taken in it by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. He has sent more than once to its annual National Week his apostolic benediction accompanied by words expressing the belief that its achievements render it worthy of being copied in other Christian lands.

To industrial workers, too, in cities and towns, Dr. O'Rahilly has brought the boon of adult education. Through his influence University College, Cork, decided five years ago to offer extramural specialised training to workers belonging to trade unions. The course offered to these men embraces Economics, Sociology, Accounting, Secretarial and Business Practice, Modern Social Organisation, Public Speaking and Conduct of Meetings. It extends over two years and leads to a diploma. The object of this training

is not only to make efficient business men but also to provide trade unionism with a leadership which respects the Church's teaching relative to economics and sociology.

This educational movement has proved to be so popular that courses with an attendance of 350 are now being given in seventeen centers in the Province of Munster. Reports coming from these centers bear ample testimony to the students' keen appreciation of the value of this training. Amongst them it is commonplace to hear very complimentary things said about this course. Well illustrating this general approval is the following tribute to this training from one of these students: "For everyone associated with a trade union it is invaluable. The subjects we learn enter nowadays into every aspect of trade unionism. In economics we acquire a knowledge of subjects closely knitted to the practical details of the productive and creative activities of trade and commerce and we feel that, in talks across the table with our employers, we can meet them on a common level of understanding. As to sociology, it gives us a thorough grasp of the ideal Christian slant in trade unionism."

The popularity of this course shows that Ireland is becoming aware that economically and sociologically she cannot safely remain passive in a world of warring ideologies and that she may well hope through this movement to provide her industrial life with men sound in ideals and well-informed in the techniques of making these ideals practical.

JAMES F. CASSIDY

Waterford, Ireland

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS AND THEOLOGY OF *MEDIATOR DEI*

Part II: Philosophy and Theology

In *Mediator Dei* Pius XII not only refutes the errors of Borgman and Doerner, but also corrects the vagaries of both the indifferent and the enthusiasts. But he does much more. He presents in summary form a beautiful and significant synthesis of Catholic teaching and worship—an integrated philosophy and theology of liturgy. Here we find a truly Catholic and doctrinal integration—one that the enthusiasts might very well use to correct their false sacramentalism and one that heretics might admire and copy in their return to historical and dogmatic values.

If we look upon the Mass as the chief medium of divine worship, and sacramental liturgy as the chief channel of divine life, centering in the Mass and Sacraments, it is clear we cannot separate the natural elements in the matter from the divine words in the form.

Apart from the essential sacramental forms which were divinely formulated and which express and confer grace and even contain it, as the Church teaches in reference to the Eucharist, there are many beautiful and significant *accessory* rites and prayers that perfect the ceremonial and that quicken, alert and dispose the attendant at Mass and the recipient of the Sacraments. These *accessory* rites cannot *licitly* be changed without explicit permission from the Holy See and its official Commission on Rites.

In other words, the liturgy has a divine and unchangeable element as well as a human or merely ecclesiastical element, as Pius XII says: "The human components admit of various modifications, as the needs of the age, circumstances and the good of souls require, and as the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may have authorized. . . .*" The Pope goes on to give the causes of this development as due, among other things, to a *more explicit formulation of doctrine.* As doctrine came to be *determined* with *greater certitude and clarity,* new ritual forms came to reflect and express the new light shed on the truths of

faith.[1] Hence if the liturgy were to return to bare table altars and the primitive undeveloped ceremonies, it would lose not only its present beauty and splendor of ritual but also its fuller and riper understanding of doctrine.

The Church is indeed a *living spiritual organism* that needs to grow and develop in divine faith and grace, in union with Christ its Head and in union with His members. As the human body requires a variety of food, so the soul requires the whole Christ as He comes to us in His earthly, priestly, redeeming life, emblazoned on the pages of the New Testament as He was foreshadowed and foretold in the Old. In the Old Testament He is symbolized by the patriarchs, prophets, and especially the priesthood of Melchisedech. In the New He comes forth as God's authorized and divine Teacher, Healer, Redeemer, food and medicine of the soul. And since Christ's redeeming work is for all, therefore all can participate in its *fruits, blessings, and graces, through the channel of the Church and the ordained priesthood.*

A perfect harmony is realized between divine faith in the mind and the divine life in the soul, brought about by the *integration* of Scripture, dogma, moral, and ascetics in liturgy. True liturgy brings out the relations between the redeeming Christ and the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Sacrament. Man's union with Christ in time and place is through the Eucharistic Christ on the altar. For Christ is not divided, but "one and the same yesterday, today and forever." The Church and her members in the unity of faith and state of grace are one with the redeeming Christ in the Mass and Sacraments. *Sacramental* liturgy becomes the highest form of divine worship and the sublimest channel of divine grace and union with Christ.

However, liturgy does *not exclude the value and need of other forms of worship and other means of sanctification.* It *presupposes and requires* private worship and private devotion. The "objective" worship of the Church requires "subjective" holiness in its members. To separate public worship from private and personal fervor and holiness, after robbing liturgy of its doctrinal faith in the historic redeeming work of Christ, was like putting man's feet in the clouds and his head in the sand.

[1] *Mediator Dei,* 50, 52.

PARTICIPATION IN THE PRIESTHOOD

After giving a beautiful synopsis of the true philosophy and inner meaning of liturgy, the Pope proceeds to point out and refute the theological errors, stemming from the jurisdictional errors of Pistoia and the doctrinal errors of the "Reformation." Let me briefly summarize the Pope's teaching on lay participation in the liturgy. The laity participate *without priestly power.* They participate as co-offerers but only in a *spiritual sense.* They participate *as victims* offering themselves with the Victim on the altar. Holy Communion *of the priest* suffices to integrate the Sacrifice. The presence and the Communion of the people are not necessary to the validity or even to the public character of the Sacrifice. Private Masses are not forbidden. The Council of Trent long before condemned Luther's contention that private Masses in which only the priest communicates are not allowed. Luther went farther, denying the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and admitting only the sacramental character thereof but not in the Catholic sense. For Luther and Protestants in general, Communion is not sacramental except in the act of receiving. Doerner and Borgman maintained the very opposite, namely, that the Eucharistic presence was permanent even after the species are dissolved in the stomach.[2]

SOCIAL SUPPER HYPOTHESIS

The Pope adds: "They therefore err from the path of truth who do not want to have Masses celebrated unless the faithful communicate; 2) and those are still more in error who in holding that it is altogether necessary for the faithful as well as the priest to receive Holy Communion put forward the captious argument that there is question here not of a Sacrifice merely but of a *Sacrifice and supper of brotherly union* and *consider the general Communion of all present the culminating point of the whole celebration.*"[3] This social supper hypothesis flows from the heretical concept of the community of priesthood as well as from an exaggerated view of Communion as a communal act. Primarily it must be a religious act of worship and only secondarily a social act. Primarily Holy Communion unites us personally and individually

[2] *Ibid.,* 80-113; 203.
[3] *Ibid.,* 113, 114.

with Christ and only through Christ with our fellowmen. This social supper theory entails a double confusion. A baptized member of Christ is confused with the ordained priest. The fundamental personal and spiritual union with Christ is equated to a social union with men. A third confusion follows: the very priesthood of Christ, based on dogma and divine institution, was in danger of becoming a synonym for the priesthood of the people—likewise condemned by the Council of Trent. Hence the confusion of lay and ordained priesthood ultimately leads to a discarding of the historical priesthood of Christ altogether. And the so-called "objective holiness" of the sacraments will obviate the need of personal holiness. Public worship so regarded will make private devotion unnecessary. And the end is a total neglect of all holiness, both public and private. Fortunately the timely encyclical halted the perversion of truth but did not as yet put a quietus on exaggerated "sacramentalism" or fully curb all false enthusiasm.

PRACTICAL COROLLARIES

The people do not share in the character and power of the priesthood, having received only the character of Christian in Baptism and the character of soldier or fellow-worker in Confirmation. They cannot concelebrate or even co-offer in the literal sense because they do not share in the powers of the ordained priesthood. But they can and should *co-offer spiritually* inasmuch as they share in the redeeming and sanctifying *effects* of the priesthood. They are not mere passive but active sharers and participants, sharing in the *fruits, benefits* and *graces* thereof. They share by self-oblation, by mental intention, moral devotion, spiritual union, zeal to abide in or recover as soon as possible the state of grace; they participate in the entire Church's unity of doctrine and holiness of purpose. In short they share in the graces *ex opere operato, ex opere operantis ecclesiae* and in the *ex opere operantis* dispositions of their own mind and will. As a rule, the desire for personal holiness is very closely associated with the desire for essential soundness in doctrine. The sanctifying power of even the sacramental mysteries, derives as the Pope says, "not from any ability of our own but by the *power of God* are they endowed with the capacity to *unite the piety of members with that of the Head* and to make this *in a sense,* the action of the whole community—

Christ acts each day to save, in the Sacraments, and Sacrifice. By means of them He is constantly atoning for the sins of mankind, constantly consecrating it [mankind] to God."[4]

POPE CONDEMNS EXCLUSIVIST HERESY

"It is *false, insidious and pernicious to conclude that all Christian piety must be centered in the mystery of the Mystical Body of Christ—with no regard for what is personal or subjective.*" The principle that Christ in His mysteries is the center of worship does not eliminate Him as also the center of faith and personal holiness, nor free us from co-operating with the grace of Christ. In other words the mysteries are not mere "objective" charms but divine means of grace and dynamic challenges to personal holiness.[5]

The inner life must be lived outwardly. The inner sense and spirit of worship must be manifested outwardly. *"Exterior worship reveals and emphasizes the unity of the Mystical Body,* feeds new fuel to its holy zeal, fortifies its energy, intensifies its action day by day. Even though the ceremonies themselves *can lay no claim to perfection* or *sanctity in their own right,* they are the outward acts of religion, designed to rouse the heart like signals of a sort to veneration of the sacred realities and to raise the mind to meditation on the supernatural. They foster piety, kindle charity, increase faith, deepen devotion, provide instruction for simple folk . . . and *continuity of religious practice.* They make it possible to tell genuine Christians from their false or heretical counterparts."[6]

Added to the false concepts of priesthood and Sacrifice deriving from liberal Protestantism, there was a very peculiar error on the glorified Christ, which aimed at substituting an idealized, glorified image instead of the crucified image above the altar and in a sense separated the Eucharistic Christ from the historical Christ who died, who arose, ascended to heaven and yet resides permanently in the Blessed Sacrament. They threw doubt upon the one identical and undivided Christ by insinuating that the human Christ who died on the Cross was no more and that a new and glorified Christ must take His place. Another confusion followed very

[4] *Ibid.,* 29.
[5] *Ibid.,* 29, 30.
[6] *Ibid.,* 23.

similar to the confusion in the mind of Nestorius who (according to St. Cyril's testimony) denied the saving or redeeming power of the flesh of Christ. Nestorius did not go as far as Cerinthus who even denied the reality of Christ's flesh. It would seem that Borgman and others implicitly held similar views. Cerinthus had Christ take a body during the bitter Passion and death only to discard it in the Resurrection. Borgman likewise dissociated the suffering Christ from the glorified Christ, though he did not discard the flesh but glorified it to the extent that he confused the Eucharistic mode of Christ's presence in the soul with the glorified natural state of His Humanity in heaven; or perhaps he confused the temporary Eucharistic presence in the soul with the longer-lasting presence of sanctifying grace. At any rate he failed to see that the Eucharistic presence abides only as long as the species are intact. Compare these errors on the Resurrection and Eucharist with the Modernistic errors condemned by Pius IX in the *Syllabus,* 29, 37, 49, 58.

The Pope condemns as false and warns against those who think and teach that the glorified human nature of Christ really and continuously dwells in the souls of the "just" by His presence and that one and numerically the same grace, as they say, unites Christ with the members of His Mystical Body.[7] Here he condemns two fundamental and far reaching errors derived from heretical notions on lay-priesthood and Mystical Body. Membership in Christ's Church is indeed founded on Baptism, whose character gives man the right to participate in the graces, benefits and favors accruing from Christ's real and natural priesthood plus the ability to participate likewise in the sacramental priesthood and Sacrifice which apply the fruits of the former. But this does not mean that Baptism, the Eucharist and the other sacraments are numerically one and the same grace or even one and same kind of grace uniting man with Christ. Much less does it mean that all men are substantially united with Christ through His grace. Whilst all the sacraments are distinct from each other they are alike insofar as they either give or increase sanctifying grace; but besides there is a peculiar grace called "sacramental" that is proper to each and corresponding to its special purpose in the mind of Christ and to our peculiar need which

[7] *Ibid.,* 203.

it is to further. Every sacrament directly gives a sacramental grace. Even though Holy Communion does not imprint an indelible spiritual character as do Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, nevertheless it perfects Baptism's initial work of incorporating men into the Mystical Body of Christ; it supplies energy and ardor to the confirmed soldier of Christ and it perfects the sacramental aids of Holy Orders. In addition it is the one sacrament to be received daily, if possible, by all, because its special purpose is to unite us and keep us united with Christ. In fact it enkindles, nourishes, perfects, and consummates the bond of love with Christ. It brings man into intimate, profound, and perfect union with grace and even the Author of grace. It nourishes, sustains, gives increased growth of love and grace. It heals the lesser wounds, it repairs the slight wounds and injuries of the soul, it builds up a reserve fund of love and grace against serious assaults upon our fervor. It arouses to renewed fervor against the frequent assaults of sensual passion and helps keep us humble in the sight of God. It does not require an advanced degree of sanctity, as the Jansenists falsely asserted, but it does have the effect of advancing us in the sentiments, the ideals, the principles and virtues of Jesus.

How does the Communion accomplish all this? Primarily by the union of the soul with Christ by love. But also by the quasi-physical contact of our bodies with the Sacred Body of the Lord. I say "quasi-physical contact" with the Sacred Body, even though Pohle-Preuss use the term "physical contact." I say quasi-physical because our body directly contacts the sacred species through which as sacred channel and sacramental sign, the Sacred Body becomes one with us. Even though Pohle-Preuss speak of physical contact with the Sacred Body, they insist that our union with Christ is spiritual, mystical, moral; not physical as the soul is joined to the body. They further state that this so-called physical contact is the means to spiritual and mystical union. They even go so far as to assert the "sacramental union with Christ which results from the bodily consumption of the Sacred Host is an application rather than an effect of the Sacrament. . . . The principal effect must be sought in the *spiritual and mystical union of the soul* with Jesus *through the theological virtue of love*, which is kindled, nourished and consummated by 'physical' contact with the Sacred Body of the Lord, *ex opere operato*. The Eucharist is the Sacrament of

Love par excellence." By the ambiguous term *"application rather than an effect of the sacrament,"* it would seem they mean that from the bodily consumption flows the sacramental union and from the sacramental union flows the increase of love and grace. By way of corollary this would imply that bodily consumption is not the real cause nor the ultimate effect of Communion. Consecration is the cause and love is the effect. The Protestants err on the *cause,* and Doerner and Borgman erred about the *effect* of Communion. Bodily consumption can be considered an *intermediary and instrumental application* to the soul of Christ's Eucharistic Love.[8]

Fr. H. G. Joyce, S.J., expresses it beautifully: The union thus effected is spiritual, not physical. The sacred humanity of our Lord comes into contact with our bodies *only through the external species of bread* and wine and when the species have undergone alteration, it remains with us no longer. No one has ever taught that there could be physical union between the sacred elements and our bodies. *Our Lord's presence with us under the sacramental veils* is the *instrument of our healing.* But it is upon the soul that His power goes forth, and so far as our bodies are benefitted, it is through the soul.[9]

The soul feeding on the God of love listens, as did Augustine, to the voice of Christ within: "I am the food of grown men, [if thou wouldst] grow, thou shalt feed upon me; nor shalt thou convert me like the food of thy flesh, but thou shalt be converted into me."

St. Leo the Great writes: "We are transformed into that which we receive, and that both in spirit and in flesh we bear the likeness of Him in whom we have died, have been buried and have risen."

Urban IV in the Bull instituting Corpus Christi writes: "This bread is eaten but not assimilated, swallowed but not transmitted; it is in no wise changed into the consumer, but if worthily received the consumer becomes like it."[10]

Mediator Dei, in short, condemned not only the false doctrines but likewise the exaggerations and contortions of the Church's teaching.

[8] Pohle-Preuss, *Holy Eucharist,* p. 220.
[9] Joyce, *Catholic Doctrine of Grace,* p. 187 (Chapter IX).
[10] *Ibid.,* pp. 181-92 (Chapter IX, "Growth in Grace").

The supremacy of the Mass and Communion is to be maintained without denying or underestimating the value and need of the other sacraments and rites and likewise without prejudice to all the other non-sacramental means of holiness. Liturgy is indeed the master key but not the only key to the heavenly treasures. The *ex opere operato* sacraments are to be integrated with the predisposing *ex opere operantis* actions, prayers, Scripture readings, etc. both public and private. In everyday practice we must unite in spiritual harmony all things in Christ. We cannot afford to neglect any "lesser" prayer, rite, blessing, holy reading that prepares us for the great central mysteries of the Mass. And let us remember that these so-called secondary things also have an absolute value as means of grace, both for Catholics and non-Catholics, if the latter are in good faith. If we may not exclude the non-sacramental from the Eucharistic center of faith, worship and life, neither may we exclude the center from its all embracing influence on the circumference of life.

We wonder how many of the common people, who generally are credited with common sense, actually fell for these esoteric errors, which they surely could not understand. For that matter no one can understand how intelligent, free, and responsible, but withal human, persons could thus forfeit their individuality by holding that one and numerically the same grace binds them as members in the Mystical Body to a merely idealized not actually glorified but alleged to be permanent Christ of human creation.

But surely the people should have understood the pernicious results of a teaching that tried to separate liturgy from private prayer and devotions and all regard for personal, individual holiness. Even though Christ's work in the soul is primary and man's co-operation in a sense secondary, it is by no means accidental or unimportant. In practice it is indispensable, for without it the primary work of grace is nullified in those "enjoying" the misuse of reason.

One need not be a theologian or philosopher to sense the tragedy of such teaching. It is quite obvious that if a man expects to profit from the gift of divine life, he must not only prepare for it but likewise endeavor to hold fast to it, lest it be lost. The Fear of the Lord is the beginning of divine wisdom; the psychotic fear of not being able to work with God, even to the point of heroism, is the

beginning of folly. To expect God to do everything and man almost nothing is inviting God to lessen His generous gift and forsake man to his own folly.

As Luther viewed justification in a purely negative way without an appreciation of elevating grace, so Doerner and Borgman seemed to reverse the process. They wanted "elevating grace" without previous purgation and disposition. Luther looked upon holiness as imputed, these exclusivists looked upon holiness as more or less superfluous.

Grace merely imputed lacks reality. Holiness viewed as superfluous outside of the liturgy implies either that man doesn't need it or that he can't acquire it outside the liturgy. The Encyclical definitely establishes the two facts that man needs holiness and that it comes to man not only through the Mass and the Sacraments but also through private prayer and personal devotions. The essential purpose of the Sacraments as means of grace is personal holiness. The teachings of Christ and the Decalogue likewise aim at the personal sanctification of man. However, both public and private devotions primarily honor and glorify God. God's glory is the first essential objective aim, sanctification and holiness the second essential aim. Both ends are equally important, though not of equal excellence. They are of equal importance inasmuch as both public worship and private prayer honor and glorify the same Creator of all. They are of unequal excellence insofar as the divine glory of the Creator is higher and nobler than the sanctification of the creature. In practice, however, one does honor God in the saving of his own soul. True liturgy integrates public and private worship. It integrates also the two essential ends of worship and prayer, the glory of God and the sanctification of men.

True liturgy does not divide Christ nor man, but unites them in faith, in love, in worship, in Scripture reading and prayer. True liturgy is to be rubrical, reverent, uniform. It must avoid all novelties, and vagaries, for such things detract from uniformity, dignity, inner reverence and even throw doubt upon orthodoxy and sincerity. A simple and reverent faith can worship God in any language. It need not be the vernacular at the altar. I am opposed to the vernacular in the Canon of the Mass. If the people are not interested in vernacular missals or missal leaflets, how can we be sure of an enlightened and sustained interest in the ver-

nacular at the altar? To me it seems that much of our liturgical propaganda for the vernacular is oblivious of two important facts; namely that unity in language makes for and continues our unity in doctrine; and secondly that faith and enlightened interest in the Mass as such can worship intelligently and devoutly also through a vernacular translation in the pews. Students of history, like the great convert Christopher Dawson, do not favor a departure from the Latin tradition at the altar. I doubt whether students of English literature would favor such a changeable medium as English at the altar.

SUMMARY

In order to get a bird's-eye view of historical deviations concerning the Church of Christ and the priesthood of Christ, both natural and sacramental, it might be helpful to look back to the age of Christological heresies. Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John the Evangelist, denied real humanity to Christ, allowing only an apparent body and denying even that after His death; Arianism denied His divine nature and hypostatic union; Nestorianism turned the hypostatic into a mere moral union between the two natures in Christ.

We see a parallel between Doerner and Borgman of the 20th century and fifth century Nestorius. Nestorius violently denied that the Son of God suffered and died, just as he refused to accept the teaching that Mary is really the Mother of God. Why this? Because he denied the hypostatic union of the Divine Person of the Son with a human nature. He denied in consequence the redeeming power of the Sacred Flesh and Blood of Christ and hence also the natural and divine priesthood of Jesus. In a similar way Doerner and Borgman ignore the suffering Jesus, saying He is dead. They substitute an idealized Christ of their own invention. Like Nestorius they divide Christ because they fail to see the hypostatic union which could not die but remains united to Jesus' undying Soul. It is the hypostatic union that remains united in the various modes of His redeeming operations on the Cross, in the Sacrifice and Sacrament and His beatific operations in heaven. In heaven the glorified Christ ratifies what the sacramental Christ does in the Mass and Sacraments, just as the sacramental Christ applies the merits of the natural-divine or theandric Christ on the

Cross. It is all one and the same Christ, the theandric Priest operating through these divinely chosen channels or modes of being and operation.

One might ask the question then how did Borgman and Doerner get these Nestorian ideas? Was it merely from the study of Church history? Hardly. It was indirectly through liberal Protestantism, through Febronianism (German Gallicanism) which culminated in Josephinism and its secular ideas of religion and religious government. The pretense at giving all bishops equal power and denying supreme papal jurisdiction was a cover up for so-called nationalistic and "Los vom Rom" delusions of Febronianism.[11]

Speaking historically, Nestorianism spread to Syria, Chaldea, India, and China. Even the Syrian bishops for a long time were tainted with it, because they saw no clear way to avoid the "confusion of the two natures" in Christ, which Monophysitism had posed. It was possibly through Oriental Mysticism that Nestorianism came from the East into Germany and Austria. It is *possible* that members of the Byzantine rite could have unwittingly been influenced by the Nestorian controversy concerning the two natures united in one Divine Personality.

Doerner and Borgman were also influenced by the trend to Hegelian ideas, if not completely to Hegelian monism. The Pope mentions no names; but we presume that they receive indirect reference when the Pope condemns the erroneous tenet that members of the Mystical Body of Christ are united to Christ *by one and numerically the same grace.* This could mean a confusion of the baptismal grace (which makes men members of the Mystical Body of Christ) with other graces that renew or increase sanctifying grace; or even identify baptismal grace with the Eucharistic Communion; or even with the beatitude of glory. Such confusion was rife. But we think the Pope refers the term "numerically the same grace" *to a monistic conception of identity of the soul in*

[11] *Mediator Dei,* 64. Also McSorley, *Outlines of Church History,* p. 576, on condemnation and final reconciliation of schismatic Bishop Ricci, appointee of Leopold of Tuscany at Council of Pistoia, 1786. He denied jurisdiction of the Pope and attempted to unite all religious orders under the Benedictine rule, was repudiated by the Catholic bishops, condemned by Pius VI but died reconciled to the Church, after submitting to the Holy See. But the undercurrent of Febronianism continued as shown at the beginning of Part I of this historical and doctrinal review.

grace with Christ the Author of grace. Whilst Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist, Holy Communion is not a substantial union with Christ but rather a spiritual and moral union with the real and substantial presence of Christ in the soul. That may be the reason why some pictured the Eucharistic presence as such as abiding even after the species is dissolved. Here is where Hegelianism and Quietism led to a kind of pantheism. How else explain the term "numerically one and the same grace" of Christ if they merely meant to identify sanctifying grace with the Eucharistic presence? It is therefore an error insofar as it identifies the sacramental Christ with a mere member of His Mystical Body.

In short the new doctrine confused the natural and sacramental priesthood of Christ as well as the lay-priesthood with clerical and ordained human priesthood. It confused the sacramental and Mystical Body of Christ. It confused the hypostatic union of the divine and human in Christ with the merely moral and spiritual union of the soul with Christ in Holy Communion. It confused the temporary Eucharistic presence of Christ's humanity in the soul of the communicant with the longer-lasting presence of sanctifying and sacramental grace in the souls of the just. It mistook antiquarianism and simplicity for true historical and scientific research into the backgrounds of doctrine, liturgy and theology. It confused sentimental fear of suffering and psychotic fear of penance with the true role and purpose (both theological and psychological) of the Cross of Christ, as *a redeeming principle* and *the redeeming factor* in Christianity. It confused objective and subjective holiness or at least failed to integrate the two in any realistic or even spiritual orientation. It confused Hegelian monism and the unity of truth. It confused scientific scholasticism and mere arbitrary and perfunctory nominalism, or in other words real thinking and mere labeling. And it mistook Quietism for mysticism; syncretism for integration, humanism for divine faith. And finally its socialistic community worship led to community of priest, community of Christ, community of God. Not evolution, but revolution and devolution.

ALBERT F. KAISER, C.PP.S.

St. Mary's Novitiate
Burkettsville, Ohio

OUR LADY'S VIRGINITY *IN PARTU*

The Marian Year began last month. As was to be expected, most Catholic periodicals marked the occasion by publishing articles about Our Lady. Unfortunately, however, one of these articles, the one entitled "A Doctor Considers the Birth of Jesus," written by Clifford E. L. Henry, M.D., and printed in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* seriously misinterpreted the Catholic doctrine about one of the high privileges God has granted to Mary, her virginity *in partu.* For the honor of Our Blessed Mother and for the good of sacred theology in the great nation of which she is the heavenly Patroness, it is important that the content of Catholic teaching about her miraculous prerogative as *virgo in partu* should be set forth clearly.

What is unacceptable about Dr. Henry's article is his attempt to explain the miraculous character of Our Lord's virgin birth. As he sees it, "The birth is pronounced miraculous without further explanation, so that an inquiring mind wonders. If there is no answer other than a dogmatic assertion of principles, it creates an antagonism that furthers the dissension."[1]

Dr. Henry takes the miraculous and virginal conception of Our Lord as the one certainly miraculous factor in His birth. After referring to the account of the Annunciation in the first chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke, he states that "It is this evidence from the Scriptures that justifies one claim that the birth of Jesus Christ was a miraculous birth."[2] Later in the same article he repeats that "Mary was a virgin by all standards, and the birth truly miraculous because of the means of conception."[3]

As far as the actual process of Our Lord's birth is concerned, Dr. Henry says that "It is well to admit that any statement is a conjecture."[4] He blames "many teachers of theology for presenting a conjecture, almost as if it is a dogma of the Church, that, at the time of birth, the body of Jesus did not pass through

[1] "A Doctor Considers the Birth of Jesus," in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* LIV, 3 (Dec., 1953), 219.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.,* 220.
[4] *Ibid.,* 222.

the normal channels of birth; the intra-uterine body was glorified and passed through the flesh of Mary as light through darkness." He teaches, however, that "This would be possible if God so willed it."[5]

This is not the "conjecture" which Dr. Henry is willing to accept. As a matter of fact, in his text, it is mentioned after a reference to the tenets of the ancient Docetists, who taught that Our Lord did not have a human body at all, and that He "was not born of Mary, but His heavenly body passed through her virgin body."[6]

It is his "conjecture" that "there was no departure from normal channels" in Our Lord's birth.[7] He bases this position on his contention that St. Luke would certainly have known and would have reported the fact "had the birth been through other than natural channels,"[8] and on his opinion that "To be in harmony with a belief that the intra-uterine life was as a human, it is reasonable"[9] to accept his solution. He further holds that his "conjecture" is upheld in "the matter of disposal of the secundines incidental to pregnancy; they no doubt passed through normal channels."[10]

The author, in supporting his contention that his "conjecture" is compatible with the Catholic teaching that Our Lady remained a virgin *in partu,* appeals to the punishment God imposed upon Eve as a result of her disobedience to the divine command in Eden, and to a somewhat inadequate concept of virginity. On the first of these two points, he holds that "it is reasonable to believe that, prior to the disobedience, the process of reproduction was to be without pain or distortion of parts; after the disobedience the judgment is that there be pain and distortion of parts during the birth of a child."[11] Thus, by reason of the fact that Mary, conceived free from all contamination of original sin, is not subject to the conditions which God imposed upon Eve as a punishment, she was enabled to bring forth her divine Child in such a way that there was "no pain and no destroying of the integrity of the body."[12]

Dr. Henry teaches that "A virgin is defined to be a female that

[5] *Ibid.,* 222 f.
[6] *Ibid.,* 222.
[7] *Ibid.,* 223.
[8] *Ibid.,* 222.
[9] *Ibid.,* 223.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.,* 220.
[12] *Ibid.,* 223.

has never received a male by force or invitation."[13] He adds that today the process of artificial insemination is likewise destructive of virginity. It is his belief that when St. Augustine taught that Our Lady remained a virgin *in partu,* he did not define the meaning of the term "virgin."[14] He holds that "It seems evident that the early Fathers assumed the definition of a virgin to be the same as in the Old Law; a woman who had never received a man."[15] Apparently, that was all that they meant when they taught that Our Lady had retained her virginity in childbirth, at least as Dr. Henry seems to believe.

Such, in substance, is what Dr. Henry has to say about Our Lady's virginity in childbirth. When we look at the content of Catholic doctrine on this subject, we find, however, a somewhat different picture. It is, of course, a dogma of the Catholic faith that Mary was and is a virgin, *ante partum, in partu, et post partum.* Such is the teaching of Pope Paul IV, in the Constitution *Cum quorundam,* issued Aug. 7, 1555.[16] The literature of scholastic theology gives a succinct but perfectly adequate explanation of what the dogma of Our Lady's virginity *in partu* actually means. In stating that the dogma signifies that Mary "gave birth to and brought forth the Child with her bodily integrity unbroken, and with the *sigillum virginitatis* inviolate, and thus certainly *ex utero clauso et obsignato,* since the tradition of the Church holds this to be a part of revealed doctrine,"[17] the great Dominican theologian of the *Angelico,* Benedict Henry Merkelbach, merely expresses the teaching of the *corpus theologorum* as a whole on this subject. Likewise in accord with the doctrine of his fellow-scholastics is Merkelbach's even more explicit statement that Our Lady's virginity *in partu* consists in the fact that "she brought forth the Child with the *sigillum virginitatis* inviolate, unbroken, unpunctured, and untorn, and *a fortiori,* without pain, which last circumstance would also have been present *in statu innocentiae.*"[18]

[13] *Ibid.,* 219.
[14] *Ibid.,* 222.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *DB,* 993.
[17] Merkelbach, in *Mariologia* (Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1939), p. 241. Cf. also Roschini, *Mariologia,* 2nd edition (Rome: Belardetti, 1948), Vol. II, pars 2, pp. 255-61; Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine* 3rd edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1939), pp. 37-46; Dublanchy, in the article "Marie," in *DTC,* IX, especially columns 2369-2386.
[18] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* p. 216.

When they speak of virginity in general, and particularly when they teach about the virginity which was one of the special privileges that God accorded to Our Lady, the theologians of the Church do not in any way limit themselves to the type of definition set forth by Dr. Henry. They describe a virtue of virginity, or *virginitas mentis,* which consists in the unbroken will to avoid everything opposed to perfect chastity, and a material or bodily virginity which is present only when the *sigillum virginitatis* remains unbroken.[19] On the subject of the virginity of Mary, the magnificently accurate and readily available *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* begins with the statement that "Virginity, in the proper sense, is the physical integrity of the organs of generation."[20]

Now the question arises: did the early Fathers of the Church mean what the scholastics mean when they ascribed virginity *in partu* to Our Lady, or did they mean only what Dr. Henry offers as his definition of a virgin? Dr. Henry refers explicitly to Saints Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

As competent a scholar and critic as Msgr. Jouassard declares that St. Jerome's teaching on this particular point is somewhat ambiguous.[21] On the other hand, St. Ambrose has done more than any of the other Fathers and Doctors of the Church to explain and to defend this thesis. St. Ambrose employed the figure of the gate which remained closed, the figure taken from the prophecy of Ezechiel, in explaining Our Lady's virginity *in partu.*[22] St. Augustine compares the virginal birth of Christ to His passing through the closed doors after His resurrection.[23]

It is quite obvious, then, that these, and the other Fathers of the Church who insisted upon the reality of Our Lady's virginity in childbirth, worked on a definite concept of virginity, which is

[19] Cf. Roschini, *op. cit.,* pp. 240 f.

[20] Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology,* translated by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951), p. 293.

[21] Jouassard, in the article "Marie à travers la Patristique: Maternité divine, Virginité, Sainteté," in *Maria: Études sur la Sainte Vierge,* sous la direction d'Hubert du Manoir, S.J. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1949), I, 110.

[22] St. Ambrose, in *Ep.* 42, *MPL,* XVI, 1125 f. The scriptural reference is to *Ez.,* 44: 2.

[23] St. Augustine, in *Ep.* 137, *MPL,* XXXIII, 519.

identical with that presented in the *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* and in the other modern texts of scholastic theology. It is true that they did not present any separate and explicit definition of virginity in the passages where they taught about Mary's virginity in childbirth, but the passages in which these teachings are contained, as well as the context of their writings, shows clearly that they did not limit themselves to Dr. Henry's notion of virginity or to what he presents as the Old Testament meaning of this prerogative.

It is likewise clear that the scholastic theologians were expounding the genuine teaching of the Fathers when, with moral unanimity they described Our Lord's virginal birth as a miracle or a mystery, insisted that it was *ex utero clauso,* and said that it must be explained as involving compenetration, the occupation of the same space by the dimensions of two distinct bodies. As early as the first decade of the second century St. Ignatius of Antioch had designated Our Lord's birth, together with His death and Mary's virginity as "three mysteries of a cry which were wrought in the stillness of God" and as having been "hidden from the prince of this world."[24] St. Thomas Aquinas is thus only following the patristic tradition when he classifies the virgin birth as one of those things which was brought about *"miraculose per virtutem divinam"*[25] and when he explains that "Christ's body, which entered into the disciples when the doors were closed was able, by the same power, to go forth *de utero clauso matris."*[26]

Dionysius Petavius, one of the Church's ablest writers in the field of positive theology, summed up his careful examination of the patristic teaching on Our Lady's virginity *in partu* with the statement that the birth of Christ *ex utero clauso,* in the same manner as that in which He went forth from the closed and sealed tomb and entered into the disciples when the doors were closed, is a statement of Catholic dogma, manifest in the testimony of ancient witnesses.[27] Francis Sylvius merely gave a more explicit form to the same traditional teaching when he asserted that, in birth, "Christ's body not only went out of the womb *sine ulla*

[24] *Ad Ephes.* 19:1.
[25] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III[a], p. 28, a. 2, ad 3.
[26] Cf. *Compend. theol.,* I[a], c. 125.
[27] Cf. *De Incarnatione Verbi,* Lib. XIV, c. 6, n. 14.

matris ruptura, but also without any opening of the members, in such a way that He went forth from the closed womb by compenetration of dimensions, in the same way that afterwards He entered into the disciples when the doors were closed."[28] Vincent Contenson is equally clear. According to Contenson "Christ went forth out of the Virgin's sacred womb, and from that part of the womb intended by nature for birth, leaving her virginal integrity unharmed, without any dilation of the maternal womb, without compression of Christ's bodily quantity, without any break or opening, but by a miraculous compenetration, like to that by which Christ's body went out of the closed sepulcher and by which He entered into the disciples while the doors were closed."[29] Albert Knoll has summed up the teaching on this point with his declaration that "it is the common teaching of the Fathers and of the theologians that Christ with His true and natural body went *ex clauso Mariae utero, eum penetrando.*"[30]

When he gives the "conjecture" of "many teachers of theology," (the only one, incidentally, which he sets forth as an alternative to his own), Dr. Henry speaks of the intra-uterine body as being "glorified."[31] In presenting what is the traditional and the correct teaching about Our Lady's virginity *in partu,* St. Thomas Aquinas makes it clear that this teaching does not in any way way involve the assumption that Our Lord's infant body was glorified at the moment of birth. He insists that the glorification of Our Lord's body was deferred until the resurrection.[32]

It is interesting to note that there was one individual theologian who, in the fourteenth century, elaborated a theory about Our Lady's virginity *in partu* quite similar to that proposed by Dr. Henry. That was the famous Durandus of Saint Pourcain.[33] He was directly concerned with the problem of conciliating his

[28] *Comm. in Tertiam Partem,* q. 28.

[29] *Theologia mentis et cordis,* Lib. X, diss. 6, c. 2, spec. 3.

[30] *Institutiones theologiae theoreticae seu dogmatico-polemicae,* Pars III, sect. 1, c. 1, a. 3, n. 287. Among more recent theologians Scheeben, in his *Mariology,* translated by Father Geukers (St. Louis: Herder, 1946), I, 108, speaks of the Catholic teaching on the virginal motherhood as involving "co-penetration."

[31] Cf. *art. cit.,* 222.

[32] Cf. *Sum. theol., loc. cit.*

[33] Cf. *In Quartum Sententiarum,* dist. 44, q. 6.

own favorite thesis, that of the absolute impossibility of the existence of two distinct bodies in exactly the same space, with the Catholic teaching about Our Lady's virginity in childbirth. In the interest of that attempt at conciliation, he proposed the hypothesis that it was possible for God to have brought about the passage of the Child through the normal channels in such a way as to have these channels open and the Child be born without either having two bodies occupy the same place or having the *sigillum virginitatis broken.*[34]

Writing in the seventeenth century, Vincent Contenson took cognizance of a theory about the virgin birth which seems to be identical with that offered last month by Dr. Henry. According to this theory, which Contenson ascribed to Erasmus, Our Lady's virginity *in partu* could be explained in the supposition that the Child had passed through the natural channels *absque corruptione et dolore,* as would have been the case had our first parents remained in the state of innocence. [35] The theories attributed to Durandus and Erasmus coincide in the supposition that all the Church really means in its dogma of the virgin birth is that the delivery of the child did not cause the destruction or an observable lesion of the hymen. Both hold that the dogma could be explained satisfactorily by the assertion that, after bearing her Child, Our Lady retained the observable physical characteristics of a virgin.

Contemporary medical history assures us that the effect for which Durandus postulated a miracle and Erasmus the condition of the state of innocence is sometimes observed in ordinary births. Physicians have described cases in which women who have given birth to a child have afterwards shown no observable physical evidence of marital contact or of childbirth. It is, of course, utterly impossible to explain the Catholic dogma of Our Lady's virginity *in partu* by holding merely that she had the physical characteristics of virginity *post partum.*

Later theologians were quite severe in their judgment on the teaching of Durandus because it was an inaccurate explanation of the dogma of Our Lady's virginity *in partu.* Bartholomew Medina

[34] Cf. Dublanchy, *art. cit.,* 2385.

[35] Cf. *Theologia mentis et cordis, loc. cit.*

described it as dangerous.[36] Gabriel Vasquez declared that it was not far from being heretical.[37] Francis Suarez said that it contradicted a genuine theological conclusion.[38] Merkelbach rejected it as fantastic.[39] Contenson characterized the theories of both Durandus and Erasmus as errors.[40]

Dr. Henry speaks continually of Our Lord's birth as taking place through the natural channels. This terminology is not in itself incorrect as long as it is understood that it took place through these channels in the sense that miraculously, and through the singular privilege God accorded to the Blessed Virgin, these passages were not opened and the *sigillum virginitatis* was not broken.

In his article, however, Dr. Henry writes in such a way as to exclude these necessary conditions. Hence his teaching on this subject cannot be received as accurate. It is not an acceptable statement about Our Lady's virginity *in partu*. And the true teaching is far from being a mere "conjecture."

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[36] Cf. *Expositio in partem tertiam Sti. Thomae*, q. 28, a. 2.
[37] Cf. *Expositio in tertiam partem*, disp. 121, c. 3.
[38] Cf. *In tertiam partem Sti. Thomae*, t. II, disp. 5, sect. 2.
[39] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 248.
[40] Cf. *loc. cit.*

Answers to Questions

THE PROPER ATTITUDE TOWARD "MUDDLED MARRIAGES"

Question: In *The Catholic Worker* for October, 1953, there is an article (reprinted from *Blackfriars*) by Fr. Gerald Vann, O.P., in which the author recommends a more lenient and sympathetic attitude toward Catholics involved in a "muddled marriage"—by which is meant a conjugal union which cannot be validated at present (for example, when one party is a divorced person whose real spouse is still living). What is to be said of the ideas advocated in this article?

Answer: That sympathy and kindness should be manifested toward Catholics involved in a "muddled marriage"—and in fact, toward all sinners—is a dictate of Christian charity. Furthermore, Father Vann is certainly correct when he states that Catholics living in invalid unions should be urged not to desist from prayer and other good works on the grounds that since they are breaking one of God's laws it is useless to try to keep the others.

However, there are other statements in this article which are difficult to reconcile with the approved theological doctrine relative to a person who is deliberately persevering in a habit of sin. Thus, Father Vann says: "To continue in it [an invalid marriage] is to sin; but to abandon it may also be to sin. This is most obvious if there are children, who, having been brought into the world, have a right to their parents' love and care, to a home and a family life." If the first sentence be taken literally, it means that there are occasions when a person is so situated that he cannot avoid committing sin, whichever course he follows—a proposition utterly opposed to Catholic teaching.

Unfortunate, too, is Father Vann's assertion: "The situation does not necessarily preclude closeness to God; it may indeed produce it." It is certainly puzzling to read the statement from the pen of a Catholic priest that the habit of mortal sin not only does not prevent a person from being close to God (which in Catholic terminology presupposes at least the state of sanctifying grace) but

even *produces such closeness.* The difficulty is not solved by Father Vann's explanation that the sin continues *unwillingly.* There is a confusion here between *involuntarium simpliciter* and *involuntarium secundum quid.* The fact that a person continues to commit sin with a certain measure of reluctance does not absolve him from guilt.

Priests who are trying to induce Catholics living sinfully in invalid marriage to desist from their sinful ways will not have an easy task with a person who can quote Father Vann's encouraging statement: "The supreme longing of the Catholic in these cases is that his love of God and his human love may somehow come to be completely compatible. Should he not be told, then, that if in the ways described he keeps close to God and accepts the suffering he has brought on himself as a form of creative expiation, God in His mercy will make this the means to the end desired: that through it in the end his partner may come to share his faith and his love?"

Father Vann corroborates his views with a quotation of a distinctively Lutheran tone from *Theologia germanica.* (Is this the work that has been put on the Index of Prohibited Books?)

A MARRIAGE PROBLEM: CORRECTION OF A PREVIOUS RESPONSE

Question: In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1953 (p. 277), it is stated that if a woman who was the child of a mixed marriage was baptized a Catholic but brought up a non-Catholic, her marriage to a non-baptized person would be valid, and that the Holy See should be asked for a privilege *in favorem fidei* if it were desirable to have this marriage dissolved. But would not such a marriage be null and void because of the impediment of disparity of cult, as prescribed by Canon 1070, § 1?

Answer: Canon 1070, § 1, asserts that anyone baptized in the Catholic Church is subject to the impediment of disparity of worship. Nevertheless, after the promulgation of the Code, there were some authorities who upheld the opinion that those persons whom the Code exempted (until 1949) from the canonical form of matrimony—that is, those who were born of at least one non-Catholic parent and baptized in the Catholic Church, but were reared from

infancy in heresy or schism or infidelity or without any religion (*Can.* 1099, § 2)—were also free from the impediment of disparity of worship (cf. De Smet, *De sponsalibus et matrimonio* [Bruges, 1927], n. 586). The theologians who held this view were in the minority; and a private decision of the Congregation of the Propaganda given in 1922, upholding the literal interpretation of Canon 1070, § 1, rendered this opinion still less tenable. Nevertheless, it was not until April 29, 1940, that a public decision of the Code Commission declared that all those who are baptized in the Catholic Church (even though brought up outside the Church) are subject to the impediment of disparity of worship (*AAS*, XXXII, 212).

It is to be noted that the marriage about which the discussion in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* centered took place in 1940. If the date of the marriage followed that on which the Code Commission's declaration took effect, the marriage was certainly null and void. But what is to be said of the validity of the marriage if it took place previous to this date? Some might argue that up to this time there was some probability that the *ab acatholicis nati, etc.*, were not subject to the impediment, so that when a declaration of the nullity of such a marriage is given, a privilege *in favorem fidei* should be asked *ad cautelam*. However, after consulting several competent canonists I have come to the conclusion that this procedure is not necessary, and that the opinion that even before the decision of 1940 the impediment bound even the *ab acatholocis nati, etc.*, can be followed safely in practice. In other words, this decision was declaratory, not extensive, and included even previous cases. Hence, the marriage discussed in the October issue was invalid, and the privilege *in favorem fidei* need not be sought.

THE STOLEN HORSE

Question: A stole a horse from B and used it on his own farm. After a month B bought another horse to replace the stolen animal. Two years after the theft, A repented and resolved to make restitution. To what extent is he bound to restitution?

Answer: In the first place, A is bound to restore the horse. If, because of special conditions encountered while in the possession

of A, the horse has become less capable of work than he would have been had he remained in possession of his rightful owner, this diminution of value must be compensated for, as far as it can be honestly computed. If, because of lack of proper care or some other cause connected with his being in A's possession, the horse has died, the value which the animal would now presumably have had if this had not occurred must be estimated and restored. On the other hand, no restitution need be made for the normal deterioration in the animal's usefulness due to the passing of time, nor for his death if this resulted from some cause which would have brought about this effect had the horse remained in the possession of B—for example, if there was some disease in the incipient stage in the horse at the time of the theft. Whatever financial loss B suffered during the month after the theft in consequence of being deprived of the animal's service must be restored. Since, however, the new horse supplied for this factor during the next twenty-three months, nothing more need be restored on these grounds. However, something must be paid for the service of the stolen horse gained by A in the course of the two years in which he used the horse on his farm. In computing this sum, whatever was required for the feeding and care of the animal can be deducted. Finally, if the money which B spent for the purchase of the new horse would have been put at interest in the meantime, the amount of this interest must be added in the sum required for restitution.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

INTERRUPTING HOLY MASS

Question: It has been the custom in this parish for fifteen or twenty years to recite the Angelus just before the prayers at the foot of the altar but after arranging the chalice and Missal. Does this not violate the rubrics?

Answer: The rubrics permit a temporary interruption of the Mass for a sufficient cause. That is done regularly on Sunday after the first Gospel when there is an interruption for the announcements and the sermon. However, normally, once the Mass has begun no interruptions are to take place. The rubric reads that

the Mass may be interrupted or even terminated before it is finished, for a reason more or less grave according to the part where the interruption occurs and its length. No rubrician would endorse an interruption such as our inquiring priest mentions, since there is not a sufficient cause.

MISSA PRO POPULO AGAIN

Question: I noticed in your column recently that the *Missa pro populo* must be offered in the parish church. Since the convent is part of the parish, would offering Holy Mass there fulfill the pastor's obligation in this regard? Since we have a large number of High Mass intentions, I do not like to leave a date open unless it is necessary, so I have been going to the convent and offering the *Missa pro populo* there. Kindly answer my problem.

Answer: Father Ayrinhac (*Constitution of the Church in the New Code of Canon Law*) in writing of this obligation for pastors remarks that the pastor should celebrate the Mass for the people in the parish church. However, the law allows the pastor to depart from this regulation when in his judgment the circumstances demand or suggest it. He goes on to say that if the pastor is away from the parish he may say the Mass himself or have his substitute offer it but again he remarks that it is to be said "in his church."

According to the interpretation given to the law the pastor would be justified in offering this Mass in the convent chapel but certainly it must not become the regular and customary procedure. It is difficult to see how this can be done as the regular thing in the convent chapel. The primary purpose of the *Missa pro populo* is for the people of the parish and since they are the first beneficiaries of this particular Mass they are deprived of a special privilege when the Mass is celebrated in the convent chapel.

RENEWAL OF THE SACRED SPECIES

Question: How frequently must Holy Mass be offered in a convent chapel for the renewal of the Sacred Species?

Answer: The Code of Canon Law states simply that Sacred Particles should not remain too long in the tabernacle. The *Caere-*

moniale episcoporum directs that the Blessed Sacrament should be changed and renewed at least once a week, and this seems to be not only the common interpretation but the custom as well. The Ordinary can determine specifically how often the Blessed Sacrament is to be renewed. Where climatic conditions or severe dampness exist renewal of the Sacred Species must be more frequent. Certainly one observes the law perfectly, when the Sacred Species is renewed weekly since then the word "frequent" of the instruction is given the strictest interpretation.

MONSTRANCE DESIGN

Question: Kindly answer a question regarding the proper form of the monstrance. I have noticed in church goods catalogues some cruciform monstrances; some have a small cross on top, others have none. Is this additional cross required? In some instances it seems superfluous.

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 2957) states that a cross should surmount the monstrance. Anson (*Churches, Their Planning and Furnishings*) states in regard to the monstrance that "the only detail that is obligatory is a small cross on the top." It is difficult to say whether or not the Sacred Congregation had in mind some of the cruciform monstrances that have appeared in recent years and have become more common. If our inquiring pastor contemplates the purchase of a new monstrance the decision of the Sacred Congregation is a safer guide to follow than a church goods catalogue.

LITURGICAL PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: (a) We have no lower or basement church. During the Forty Hours' Devotion we had a funeral. What was the solution to my problem, since the funeral took place at a late hour in the morning? (b) Is the monstrance veil required or just recommended? (c) In our community often a deacon exposes the Blessed Sacrament at the convent chapel. May he also in the absence of a priest incense the Blessed Sacrament?

Answer: (a) Since the funeral took place at a late hour there was only one solution to the problem. We presume that there were suitable reasons for not wanting to have the funeral at a neighboring church. Such being the case, Father would have to repose the Blessed Sacrament with the *Tantum ergo* and the usual Blessing. After the Exequial Mass, he would expose the Blessed Sacrament again. (b) The Sacred Congregation gave a decree (No. 4268, § 7) stating that the monstrance must be covered with a white veil when it is on the altar both before and after exposition or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. (c) All of the books of ceremonies when describing Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament direct the priest or celebrant to do the incensing. It is clearly not within the province of the deacon since he is only an auxiliary to the celebrant, and that by a very special privilege of his ordination to the deaconate.

USE OF THE ORGAN

Question: Is it strictly forbidden to use the organ during Lent and Advent? We have difficulty with our church choir if the organ cannot be used.

Answer: The regulation is not to use the organ during Lent and Advent at sung Masses except on Laetare and Gaudete Sunday and Holy Thursday until the conclusion of the *Gloria in excelsis.* Feast days that are celebrated with some solemnity during these penitential seasons are an exception and the organ may be used. The Sacred Congregation in its decision No. 4265 said that the organ may be used as an aid to the choir to sustain the chant and the music, but not on the last three days of Holy Week.

METROPOLITAN CROSS

Question: The Ordinary of our diocese is an Archbishop but the diocese is not an Archdiocese. Since he is soon to visit my parish I am wondering about metropolitan cross for the procession.

Answer: The metropolitan cross is the proper insignia of a metropolitan archbishop and he has the right to its use only within

his province. Outside of his province he is not entitled to it. When it is used the cross bearer walks immediately before the Metropolitan and with the image of the crucifix turned toward the Archbishop. Where the Ordinary has the title of Archbishop but his See is not an archdiocese, this is a personal honor and distinction that does not entitle him to the privileges of a metropolitan archbishop.

CLOTH OF GOLD FOR VESTMENTS

Question: Recently samples were forwarded to me advertising gold vestments. I enclose a sample and would be pleased if you would tell me exactly what is meant by cloth of gold or silver.

Answer: Dom Roulin (*Vestments and Vesture*) says "that stuffs called cloth of gold and cloth of silver are simply fabrics woven of silk and metal threads combined." Msgr. Collins says this material, to meet the requirements, must be "cloth which has been woven of real gold threads or from material which is in greater part of real gold or at least silvergilt."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

INDULGENCES FOR MARY'S YEAR

The indulgences mentioned in the decree of the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary (Nov. 11, 1953) are: plenary *toties quoties*, plenary, partial of ten years, and for the dead, the privileged altar.

The plenary indulgence *toties quoties* may be gained on Dec. 8, 1953, the opening day of the year of Mary; Feb. 2, 1954, the feast of the Purification; Mar. 25, the feast of the Annunciation; Aug. 15, the feast of the Assumption; Sept. 8, the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady; Sept. 15, the feast of the Seven Dolors; Dec. 8, 1954, the closing day of the year of Mary.

On those days, therefore, a plenary indulgence can be gained as often as the prescribed work is performed, though usually a plenary indulgence can be gained but once a day, even if the prescribed work is repeated.[1]

To be capable of gaining indulgences one must be baptized, not excommunicated, in the state of grace, at least at the end of the prescribed works, and a subject of the one granting the indulgence.[2] In order, furthermore, that one capable of gaining them may really acquire them it is necessary that he have at least a general intention to acquire them and that he perform the required works at the time prescribed and in the proper manner.[3]

The works prescribed for the gaining of the plenary indulgences *toties quoties* are a visit to a temple built in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary and prayer according to the intention of the Pope. With regard to the prayer according to the intention of the Pope, it should be noted that mental prayer alone does not suffice. Though the vocal prayers are usually left to the choice of the faithful, the prayers for the plenary *toties quoties* are six Our Fathers, six Hail Mary,s and six Glorias.[4]

[1] Cf. Can. 928, § 1.
[2] Cf. Can. 925, § 1.
[3] Cf. Can. 925, § 2.
[4] Cf. Can. 934 §§ 1-3; *S. Paenit.* July 5, 1930 (*AAS* 22-363); July 18, 1935 (*AAS* 27-315).

With regard to the visit to a temple built in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a problem might arise for those in religious communities. According to Canon 929 the faithful of either sex who, for reasons of perfection or of instruction or education or even of health lead a common life in houses which lack a church or public chapel, but which have been established with the consent of the Ordinaries, and all persons dwelling there to minister to them, can, whenever to gain indulgences there is prescribed a visit to some indeterminate church or to some indeterminate public oratory, visit the chapel of their own house in which they can lawfully satisfy the obligation of hearing Mass, provided they properly perform the other works imposed.

The problem arises from the fact that the grant of these indulgences requires a visit to a temple built in honor of the Blessed Virgin, yet it does not specify any particular temple. The question then arises whether the church to be visited is so indeterminate as to allow application of Canon 929 in favor of those mentioned in that Canon. *Salvo meliori judicio,* it would seem that although mention is made of a temple built in honor of the Blessed Virgin it is said that one can visit any such temple. In other words a visit to one particular church is not prescribed. From this it would seem one might reasonably conclude that the church to be visited is really indeterminate and that, therefore, the religious can use the benefits of Canon 929.

A further requirement for the gaining of the indulgences is that the subject shall have confessed his sins and received Holy Communion. The Canons provide that if perchance confession is required to gain any indulgences it can be made within the eight days which immediately precede the day to which the indulgence is annexed; the Communion can be received on the day before; and both can be done likewise within the whole succeeding octave.[5]

The faithful who are accustomed, unless lawfully impeded, to go to confession at least twice a month, or to receive Holy Communion in the state of grace and with a right and pious intention daily, though once or twice a week they may not receive it, can gain all indulgences even without the actual confession which otherwise would be necessary to gain them, excepting the indul-

[5] Cf. Can. 931, § 1.

gences whether of the ordinary and extraordinary jubilee or the jubilee ad instar.[6]

The plenary *toties quoties* is annexed to certain days, so it is proper to recall that if a visit to a church or oratory is required in order to gain an indulgence annexed to a certain day, the visit can be made at any time from noon of the preceding day until midnight of the day itself.[7]

The plenary indulgences may be gained through reception of the Papal Blessing given by the residential Bishop during the pontifical ceremonies on the opening and closing days, through visiting the temple, as aforesaid, on Saturdays, in group pilgrimages, by being present at some sacred function in honor of the Blessed Virgin, and by visiting one of Our Lady's unusual shrines where a plenary indulgence can be gained on any day of Mary's year by visiting the shrine, and praying for the intention of the Holy Father, provided one has been to confession and received Communion.

The partial indulgence of ten years is given those who are present at some sacred function in honor of the Blessed Virgin and have a contrite heart, even if they have not a chance to confess and receive Holy Communion.

For the deceased, all altars dedicated to the Blessed Virgin are privileged this year, i.e. the Masses said there are enriched with a plenary indulgence in favor of the person for whom they are offered.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[6] Cf. Can. 931, § 3.

[7] Cf. Can. 923.

Book Reviews

REALITY AND JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS. By Peter Hoenen, S.J. Translated by Henry F. Tiblier, S.J. Chicago: Regnery, 1952. Pp. 344. $6.00.

If there were a Legion of Decency rating for philosophical books, we should have to classify this one as "B: objectionable in part." It is at once a work of real value, in that it makes a number of significant contributions on important points, and yet a dangerous one, in that it can seriously mislead the nonprofessional reader by going contrary to one of the fundamental inspirations of the Thomistic theory of knowledge. It must be read, accordingly, with great critical attention and recommended only with serious reservations to those seeking the authentic mind of St. Thomas on the nature of the judgment.

Let us examine the credit side of the ledger first. The general value and usefulness of the book derives from the fact that it contains perhaps the best and fullest collection of texts of St. Thomas on the judgment that this reviewer has seen anywhere, at least in English. The Latin and English are always given together, so that it is possible to check the accuracy of translations and interpretations with facility, an outstanding asset that might well be imitated by other books of the kind. The translator, too, deserves high praise for the habitual clarity, accuracy and smoothness of his rendering of both French and Latin.

The first part of the book consists of a "phenomenological" or descriptive analysis of the structure and nature of the judgment. The principal contribution of the author here is the demonstration by both texts and intrinsic reasoning that it is not, as frequently asserted in many standard Thomistic expositions, the judgment itself which first sets up the nexus between the subject and predicate. This link must be already given in the data as previously apprehended by sense and intellect. The role of the judgment is solely to refer this already perceived relationship, this objective structure of the thing (*dispositio rei,* as St. Thomas calls it), back to reality itself from which it was derived, and hence merely to affirm: "So it is in reality (*ita esse in re*) as I apprehend it." Otherwise, if it were the judgment itself which first set up a link between subject and predicate not yet previously apprehended as in the thing, it would be adding on a new content of knowledge of its own not contained in the preceding apprehension; and it is difficult to see whence it could derive this new content.

There is a further crucial point in the analysis. Between the initial apprehension and the final assent there takes place a moment of spontaneous critical reflection in which the intellect sizes up or judges the evidence. When the necessity of the latter appears sufficiently, the mind then follows through with its assent and commits itself absolutely to what it affirms. The author lays great stress—and justly so, it seems—on this moment of critical reflection preceding the judgment. He shows how from this fact, that every judgment is of its very nature spontaneously critical, the validity of our natural certitudes and the basic capacity of the mind to attain reality are already sufficiently grounded and implicitly recognized by the mind prior to the carrying out of any explicit philosophical critique. Although the author has a tendency to generalize unduly from certain texts of St. Thomas, especially as regards the link between necessity and intelligibility, his conclusions in the main seem justified, save for the fundamental defect to be mentioned below.

The second part of the book attempts a critical justification of the objectivity or realism of the judgment in accordance with the mind and method of St. Thomas. The author here shows very well how the first spontaneous reflection in every judgment may be explicitly and scientifically prolonged either in the direction of the object, to deliver the first principles of metaphysics and of mathematics (this last is considerably less certain), or in the direction of the subject to reveal the cognitive nature of the intellect and the first principles of epistemology. He also analyzes admirably how first principles and other universal analytic propositions are understood first only as imbedded in some concrete exemplification, not by any prior abstract analysis.

But it is in this part of the book also that there emerges clearly the defect which seriously vitiates its whole claim to be an exposition of the Thomistic theory of judgment. This is a strong tendency toward Suarezian essentialism in the interpretation of what being means for St. Thomas and an almost complete failure to incorporate what is now recognized as one of the central theses of Thomistic philosophy, namely, the role of the act of existence (*esse*) as the source not only of all ontological perfection but of all intelligibility. This underlying essentialist attitude is all the more deceptive as the author gives the impression of stressing heavily what he calls "the existential character" of every judgment (Chap. 2: Judgment and Existence). But he gives himself away when he explains that the "existence" and the "being" which the judgment affirms is primarily only that of possible being, namely, an intelligible essence which, precisely because it is intelligible, is understood as being really possible and therefore possessing some relation to existence, though not necessarily actual existence.

It is henceforth in terms of possible essence exclusively that the author sets about to justify the "realism" of all the main types of judgment (except that of pure perception, which he saves till the end). The process is as follows. First the intellect sees within the sense content some link of necessity between subject and predicate, either direct, as in analytic judgments, or accompanying, as the principle of contradiction, in judgments on contingent matter. This necessity is what renders the content intrinsically intelligible. In this intelligibility, in turn, the intellect finds the necessary and sufficient guarantee of the objective "being" (= real possibility) of the subject-predicate composite. For the mind sees intuitively, as a first principle, that what is intrinsically intelligible must necessarily be truly possible, capable of actual existence, and hence is *ipso facto* a genuine "being" (= a possible essence). Thus the passage is from necessity to intelligibility to (possible) being. In all the principal types of judgment save that of pure perception the process stops there and is self-justifying because taking place entirely within the intellect itself, depending on the senses only for the presentation of a content on which to work, without any need of an accompanying perception of actual existence or even of any awareness of the senses as cognoscitive faculties (p. 176).

The author does not hesitate to draw the consistent—but for a Thomist astonishing conclusion: "This *esse* is the *esse in re* as realism understands it, the *esse* which all consider as the *esse* of realism. . . . It is true that it is not yet the actual *esse* . . . the affirmation is as yet only a recognition of the structure as a being (*cui competit esse*); but this *esse* is that of realism. The *esse* of realism has no other meaning" (p. 166).

How far this conclusion and the process leading to it is from the mind of St. Thomas is evident from a careful inspection of the series of texts which the author himself quotes in support of his own analysis (pp. 193-94). Whereas Father Hoenen discovers first that "the intelligible is being," and then by immediate conversion that "being is intelligible," all the texts of St. Thomas quoted make the passage in exactly the opposite direction, from being in act to intelligibility. For St. Thomas, it is precisely the being in act (or some connection with it) which renders anything intelligible, and the fundamental act is the act of *esse,* from which flows the actuality and hence intelligibility of every form and essence. Hence a genuine Thomistic critique of the judgment must begin with the judgment of actual existence and justify all other types by some link with it.

The inadequacy of the author's explanation appears even more decisively when near the end of the book he finally takes up the validation of the judgment of actual existence. Here for the first time, the author

contends, the intellect has to extend its critical reflection preceding assent to discover the cognoscitive validity of the sense faculties. How is this done? After hinting at various lines of solution (such as casual inference), which he admits do not seem to express the immediate realism of St. Thomas, he finally discovers the key to the solution in a few texts wherein St. Thomas, speaking of artists and geometricians, says that they come to know their constructions by actually making them (*facientes cognoscunt*). These few texts, dealing with a special kind of knowledge only, the author now generalizes as the universal explanation for St. Thomas of how we know the validity of *all* our judgments of pure perception or actual existence.

Such a theory of knowledge by action may well have serious merits of its own, although it would require much more careful working out than the summary treatment given here. But it has no serious foundation in the texts of St. Thomas himself and it is quite misleading to present it as his position. It is indubitable that for him the intellectual awareness of the senses as being actively determined from without, hence as by their very nature cognoscitive faculties, is an evident first principle of his whole theory of knowledge. Father Hoenen's whole construction (in large part sound and still usable, as we have said) must therefore be judged to have failed seriously in the central task it set out to accomplish, namely, to show how St. Thomas grounds the human judgment on a genuine contact with "reality.' It is unpleasant to have to criticize so severely a work into which has clearly gone so much serious and fruitful labor, but we feel it necessary in order that its title may not mislead many students (and even professors) into accepting it as a guide to the true mind of St. Thomas.

There is a valuable appendix containing the English translation of Father Boyer's *Gregorianum* article interpreting a key existemological text of the *De veritate,* q. 1, a. 9.

W. Norris Clarke, S.J.

Outlines of Moral Theology. By the Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1953. Pp. xii + 247. $3.75.

When a reviewer is given a book which makes pleasurable reading his task is made easier. The reviewer found *Outlines of Moral Theology* a pleasure to read because the presentation of the subject matter of Moral Theology was done with that clarity and precision which has characterized all of the former writings of Father Connell, dean of the School of Sacred Theology at The Catholic University of America. The book was intended primarily for the laity to aid them in acquiring a deeper knowledge of that most sublime science, Sacred Theology.

There is no doubt that the book will fulfill its primary purpose. I believe that the book will also serve its secondary purpose, a concise and helpful summary of the more complete course of Moral Theology conducted in the seminary. The detailed index will be a further aid in making *Outlines of Moral Theology* a ready reference book for a brief but accurate solution of moral problems that may be presented to a priest.

A study of Ethics as a preparation for living a Catholic life and for a rational defense of an absolute moral code is highly commendable. There is, however, one serious drawback to the procedure—Ethics prescinds from the notion of divine revelation, the fact of the Church as an infallible teacher, and prescinds from the fact that man has been raised to the supernatural life through the reception of the Sacrament of Baptism. Efforts have been made to remedy this situation by presenting to the laity a scientific exposition of Moral Theology. One of the obstacles to the execution of this plan has been the scarcity of books in English which on the one hand avoided being a mere popular presentation and at the same time avoided being a mere translation of one of the authors commonly used in the seminary course in Moral Theology. Father Connell has steered a middle course in an admirable fashion. Even the most complex section of Moral Theology is treated with a clarity that bespeaks his comprehensive knowledge of the subject. For the most part, the author has avoided using technical expressions and when such expressions are used he has been careful to explain their meaning. The many well-chosen examples afford practical applications of the moral principles being explained.

The book is divided into three parts: the first part is given over to a study of such subjects as the final end of man, the means to attain that end and the *regulae* of man's actions. In this section we find a brief explanation and summary (51 pages) of Fundamental Moral Theology. The sections on *conscience* and the *virtues in general* are particularly well done. The author uses many practical examples to illustrate the moral principles being discussed. The reviewer believes that Father Connell would have done a further service to the layman had he included more "Cases" and "Problems to be discussed." Moreover, since a priest will not always be available to supervise the discussions in study clubs, the author might in the appendix of future editions explain the solution of the cases step by step.

In the treatment of the various moral systems which one may use to form a practically certain conscience, the author's defense of the system of Equiprobabilism is quite natural, but the reviewer thinks that his statements in praise of the system would be contested by many; for example: ". . . if a person sincerely desires to know the truth he will

accept a more probable opinion, since in this way he has the assurance of being correct in a greater number of cases in the long run" (p. 44).

In discussing what is commonly termed special Moral Theology the author follows those theologians who treat the subject under the aspect of the virtues involved. This procedure, especially for the laity, helps to give a more positive approach to the subject matter. Father Connell very ably treats the complex subject, the virtue of faith. He devotes three pages to *religious communication.* In those three pages many practical difficulties that have beset the lay Catholic are solved; for example, when a Catholic may act as bridesmaid or best man at a non-Catholic religious marriage (p. 76). Problems concerned with the principles involved in determining violations of the virtue of charity, such as co-operation in the sin of another and the giving of scandal are contained in concise statements. The more common occasions when material co-operation may occur and the times when one may violate the virtue of charity by giving scandal are discussed. Other authors have treated the matter of co-operation at great length, but no one has treated the subject more clearly.

The third section of the book deals with the sacraments. In this section Father Connell explains the doctrinal and moral aspects of Sacramental Theology. The method is both speculative and practical. The presentation and development of the basic theological principles concerning the sacraments is complemented with an application of these principles to the needs of modern Catholics and a brief explanation of the rules regarding the administration and reception of the sacraments.

It would seem pedantic to submit a volume such as this to a thorough investigation of the author's stand on disputed theological questions. In the preface the author states that he will propose commonly accepted theological teachings, in order to keep the book within due limits. There is a rare occasion when a statement might be questioned or a statement misunderstood. The following is an example of a statement which could be questioned (the author is considering a person's obligation to attend an entire Mass): "To miss the Consecration alone, however, would seem to be grave, and most [authors] would say the same of the priest's Communion" (p. 145). Saint Alphonsus maintained this view but not many authors have held it since them. For this reason I do not think we could say "most" authors. There is a statement on page 172 with regard to onanism and contraception which might be misunderstood by a lay person. In future editions the author might further clarify the matter.

The general effect of this latest work of Father Connell will be excellent for those for whom the book was primarily intended. There is no doubt that *Outlines of Moral Theology,* if studied and not merely read, will give the lay student a scientific knowledge of Moral The-

ology; he will also be enabled to detect the flaws in the arguments proposed by secularistic minded writers. Moreover, the lay student should be able after a study of the book to give a satisfactory explanation to the many questions put to him by interested non-Catholic friends and acquaintances. One who has no supervised theological training will derive the most profit from the book if he studies it under the supervision of a priest. Finally, *Outlines of Moral Theology* will provide a practical summary of the more complete seminary course for those who are engaged in the study of Sacred Theology. Those who have completed their theological training will find the book a helpful reference work for a brief solution of the moral problems that may be presented to them.

KENNETH B. MOORE, O.CARM.

FATHER TOMPKINS OF NOVA SCOTIA. By George Boyle. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1953. Pp. 234. $3.00.

Here is a book about a lovable priest whose charm and gentility did not prevent him from being a visionary with the will to fight for his ideas and for the poor.

His life is divided into two great parts, his work for St. Francis Xavier University and his work for the co-operative movement in Nova Scotia. In both endeavors he was energetic, brilliant, but always humble.

His views on adult education were in advance of his times and still await general acceptance by the American Church. "Our colleges must catch the spirit of service—service of the whole people in matters, national, civic, educational, and social. Our colleges have been turning out men for the most part devoid of social consciousness. . . . The time has come when our colleges should not only be homes of learning but leaders of thought adapting themselves to modern problems" (p. 65). "The usefulness of the University often ends precisely when and where it ought to begin. And university men's learning, their degrees, and their acquirements find their end in livelihood, in personal distinction, in social advancement, and not (where these ought to) in the enrichment and uplift of the common life" (p. 88).

Father Tompkins was no dreamy idealist. Few men were better fund-raisers and few priests could obtain money from secular philanthropies so successfully. The greatest cross of his life was when his Bishop removed him from the college ostensibly for too vigorously supporting the idea of federating St. Francis Xavier with several non-Catholic colleges. At fifty-two years old the vision of parish work for which he deemed himself unsuited and had no prior experience depressed and terrified him. But he went on to carve out for himself and Nova Scotia the co-operative movement, whose fame is now world-